MILIUKOV ON RUSSIAN LIBERALISM

1890 - 1906

by

Tova Yedlin

September 24, 1959

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

MILIUKOV ON RUSSIAN LIBERALISM, 1890 - 1906

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF .....ARTS.....

DEPARTMENT OR DIVISION ....HISTORY.....

by

TOVA YEDLIN

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

September 24, 1959.

OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

This thesis is not a purely biographical study of P. N. Miliukov. Nor is it intended to be an interpretation of Russian liberalism. Its main purpose is the study of Miliukov's views on Russian liberalism as they appeared at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. An attempt is made here to find in his works written during that period, the basis for his theory that a liberal and constitutional government in Russia was possible despite the peculiarities of her historical evolution. This theory was the guiding star of all Miliukov's political activity. The study, divided into five chapters, contains a biographical sketch of Miliukov, his philosophy of history, his critique of the Slavophile interpretation of the Russian historical process, and his views on the past, present and future of Russian liberalism. The concluding chapter gives a brief account of some of the other interpretations of Russia's past and of her development in the future, as well as an attempt at an evaluation of Miliukov's ideology.

The study, with exception of Chapter V, is based on the historical and journalistic writings of Miliukov as they appeared during the period from 1890 to July 1906, the dismissal of the first Duma, and the publishing of the Vyborg Manifesto. This date seems to be a landmark in the history of Russian liberalism of the more militant type, whose spokesman Miliukov was at that time.

Added to these sources are his Vospominaniia (Memoirs) which were written during the declining years of his life and serve therefore in this study only to illuminate certain details of a biographical nature. Two addresses of Miliukov, delivered before an American audience in 1904 and in 1908, are also included.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In the early hours of March 3, 1917, Kerenskii phoned up the residence of Count Putiatin in St. Petersburg and in the name of the members of the Provisional Government asked permission to meet with the Grand Duke Mikhail Alexandrovich. The meeting took place the same morning. In a strained voice, full of pent up emotions, one of the members of the Provisional Government addressed the Grand Duke with the following words:

> If you should refuse, Your Highness, there will be destruction...Russia will lose its axis, which is the monarch. The oath of the sovereign is the only thing that binds the country together. Anarchy and chaos will follow your refusal The monarch is the only centre, without him there will be no government, no Russia...[1]

These words were spoken by Pavel Nikolaevich Miliukov, the leader of the party of Constitutional Democrats, and one of the foremost Russian historians of the time. M. Aldanov,[2] writing in honour of Miliukov's seventieth birthday in 1929, remarked that many years ago he tried to determine the "double genealogy" of Miliukov. One line of this genealogy coincided with the path of the radical Russian intelligentsia, the other led to Russia's tradition as a great power. It was this second line that influenced Miliukov's actions during the February Revolution in 1917, a thing fatal to

---

[1]Quoted in S. A. Smirnov, P. N. Miliukov, Sbornik materiialov po chestvovaniiu ego semidesiletiia (Paris, 1929), p. 37.

[2]M. A. Aldanov (1889-), Russian novelist and publicist, emigrated to France in 1919.

all that he fought for during the years of his political work.

In March, 1917, Russian liberalism had its one chance (slim as it was) to succeed, and Miliukov stood as its acknowledged leader. He apparently threw away the opportunity by adhering dogmatically to monarchism and then to the tradition of Russia as a great power. In the words of Sukhanov:

> Miliukov was at the time the central figure, the spirit and backbone of all bourgeois political circles...this fateful man was the only one capable of incarnating, in the eyes of Europe, the new bourgeois Russia that had arisen on the ruins of Rasputin's land-holding society...[3]

Miliukov and his party failed. In order to understand the fate of Russia's liberalism, an examination of the conceptions of its foremost representative is required. Although a number of studies on Russian liberalism have appeared recently,[4] none devotes much attention to the man, who more than anybody else, was responsible for the direction this movement took in the years from 1904 to 1917. Today the name of Miliukov is very little known in the English speaking countries, despite the fact that in the days of the February Revolution, he occupied in his party as important a position as Lenin in the Bolshevik and Chernov in the Social Revolutionary parties. No biography of Miliukov is available, and his works that were written in Russian have not been translated with the exception of Professor Karpovich's adaptation of the Outlines of Russian Culture.

---

[3]Quoted in R. H. McNeal, "The Russian Revolution; Why Did the Bolsheviks Win?" Source Problems in World Civilization (New York: Rinehart Co. Inc., 1959), p. 26-27.

[4]See G. Fischer, Russian Liberalism (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1958); D. W. Treadgolt, Lenin and His Rivals (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1955); V. Leontovitsch, Geschichte des Liberalismus in Russland (1762-1917) Frankfurt, 1957).

CHAPTER I

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

> I have never aspired to change from an historian into a politician but it so happened because it became an urgent demand of the time.
>
> - P. N. Miliukov, "Vospominaniia"

Born in 1859, on the eve of the Great Reforms, Miliukov saw in the date of his birth a happy coincidence. It enabled him, he later wrote, to escape the influences of the populist and marxist ideologies, which were preponderant in Russian thought in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. He was younger than the generation of the seventies' which was under the spell of populism, and older than the generation of the eighties' and nineties' which pledged allegiance to Marx; by the time marxist teachings gained influence, his views were already firmly established. The decisive influence exerted upon Miliukov was that of the English rationalist philosophers, Locke and Hume, as well as the positivist philosophy of Comte. He was captivated by the works of Spencer and Mill. His birthplace was Moscow, the ancient capital of the Tsars, and here he spent his childhood and youth. His father, a gifted but impecunious architect, had little time for the family. Miliukov learned from his father the rudiments of drawing and the appreciation of art. His mother, a domineering and a proud woman, belonged to the gentry and apparently resented

the fact that the Miliukovs could not prove their social affiliation with the class she belonged to. The domestic life of the Miliukovs did not seem to be a happy one. The 'sixties' during which time Miliukov was growing up, were distinguished at the beginning by the emancipation of the serfs, and the great enthusiasm and hopes that were laid in Alexander's forthcoming program of reforms. The failure to carry out the reforms brought disenchantment and the resumption of the terrorist activities. Revolutionary ideas began to make greater inroads among the radicals of the Russian intelligentsia. The liberals concentrated in the zemstvos (self-government) continued their work of peaceful civilizing the people and demanded political reforms. In the intellectual sphere the echo of the controversy between the Slavophiles and the Westerners was still heard in the writings of Danilevskii and Leont'ev. In the field of history, S. M. Solovev, was busy writing his voluminous and famous History of Russia.

The young Miliukov and his brother found their interests in the "battles" they conducted in their back-yards, and since the family moved quite often, there were always new friends and new experiences. The summers and holidays were spent at Pushkino where the Miliukovs had a country home. It was during this period that religion began to occupy a place in the life of Paul Miliukov. He was greatly impressed by the ceremonial of the Orthodox church and for a while attended services regularly. He found however no encouragement at home, where his parents limited the religious education of the boys to the observance of holidays and attendance to confessions. Many years later Shipov,[1] when characterizing

---

[1]P. N. Miliukov, Vospominaniia (New York: Izdatelstvo Chekhova, 1955), Vol. I, p. 393.

Miliukov before Nikolai II said "in his world outlook Miliukov is primarily a rationalist, a positivist historian, and religious consciousness is little developed in him." Soon studies were to take the place of childhood games and Miliukov found in them escape from the cold atmosphere of his home life. He distinguished himself by his ability, intellectual curiosity, and power for concentrated work. He tried to write poetry, read widely and studied music. The seventies', the years that Miliukov spent at school, were marked by the movement "to the people" conducted by the populists, increased terrorist activities, and retaliatory measures of the government. The general atmosphere in the country had its influence upon the high school students as well. They organized special circles for the study of philosophy, history and contemporary problems. It is of interest that when Miliukov's turn came to lecture in one of such circles, his topic was "Originality and Imitation". In this lecture he defended the idea of imitation as an inevitable and progressive phenomenon. To this period belonged also the letter written by Miliukov to Dostoevskii asking for his opinion on the riots of 1876 that took place between the students and the butchers from the district of Okhotnyi Otriad. Dostoevskii's answer came as a great disappointment to Miliukov and his friends. In his reply, Dostoevskii stressed the idea that the fault for the riots lay with these Russians who turned to the West in the quest for answers to their problems, instead of turning to the Russian people, who alone could bring salvation. Although Miliukov's own theory that Russia is also Europe was not yet firmly established, his thoughts turned more and more in this direction.

The years spent at school were for Miliukov years of intensive study. A voracious reader he spent all his meagre earnings on books, and the basis for his future encyclopaedic erudition was laid then. Enrolled at the Moscow University in the year 1877, Miliukov first studied philology and later devoted himself to the study of history. In addition to their studies, the university students were preoccupied with the political problems of the time. It seems that Miliukov with his fellow students of the faculty of arts, followed a middle path between the left and the right groups.

The assassination of Alexander II in March 1881 and the reactionary policy of Alexander III brought repurcussions into the life of the students. For his participation in one of the students' gatherings that were forbidden Miliukov was suspended from University for one year. This delayed his graduation, but made possible a very interesting and stimulating trip to Europe. Europe made a profound and lasting impression on the young Moscovite student. Back at the University, he devoted his time and ability to the study of Russian history, and he soon distinguished himself by his independent thinking and inclination to do original research and to explore topics that were not extensively dealt with. The magistral examination, which he passed with honours, opened for him the doors of the Moscow University where he remained in the capacity of a lecturer. His magistral work, the heavily footnoted volume on the <u>State Economics of Russia in the First Quarter of the XVIII Century and the Reforms of Peter the Great</u> earned him the name of a promising historian. In

recognition of the scholarly work presented by Miliukov, the Examination Board was ready, but for the objection of Professor Kliuchevskii, to grant him a doctor's degree. It was at that time that Miliukov made a vow never to submit any of his works with the purpose of obtaining another degree. The dissertation appeared in print in 1892. At the same time Miliukov was asked to prepare for the pedagogical courses in Moscow a series of lectures on the development of Russian culture. He accepted the challenge and thus was born the idea of the Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury (Outlines of Russian Culture). He admitted the influence of Guizot's Histoire de la civilisation en France upon the structure of his work. Not events but processes in every field of life were to be stressed in their consecutive development. His aim to write the history of people in all its aspects of economic, social, political, religious and institutional development was hereby fulfilled. The first two volumes of this most widely known of his works was completed in 1895. To this period belong also the yearly articles written for the English magazine Athenaeum; in these articles he reviewed Russian literature and wrote about the various political movements in Russia and their ideologies. Therein his leanings towards the ideas of the liberals as well as his sharp criticism of the populists can be discerned.

The nineties' brought revived political activity in the country. The liberals continued with their work in the zemstvos (self-government) in which education played an important role. It was this work that provoked the caustic remark of Lenin "that if

anyone wants to save the fatherland in the Committee on Illiteracy, we won't hinder him."[2] Miliukov became a chairman of the committee on adult education and went to England to study the ways and means of organizing this type of work. It seems that he rather liked the role of a Kulturträger. During this period an important event in his private life took place. Miliukov married Anna Sergeevna Smirnova, the daughter of an Archpriest and a student of his former professor, Kliuchevskii. Arrested in 1894, on rather flimsy charges, Miliukov was banished from St. Petersburg and thus began for him the years of wanderings. Exiled to Riazan' he spent there two years during which he succeeded to prepare for print his third important historical work Glavnye techeniia russkoi istoricheskoi mysli (Main Currents of the Russian Historical Thought). It has been highly valued by the historians as a fundamental work in Russian historiography. The second stage of his exile he spent in the Balkans. Appointed professor of history at the University of Sofia, Miliukov headed in 1897 for Bulgaria. His career there came to an abrupt end. He was dismissed on the demand of the Russian Government on the ground of his absence from an official levee in honour of the birthday of Nikolai II. Miliukov remained in the Balkans studying the languages of the various nationalities and their political and social conditions. He participated in archaeological expeditions and spent some time in Turkey.

Granted permission to return to the homeland in 1899,

---

[2]Krupskaia, Memoirs of Lenin (Quoted in G. Fischer, Russian Liberalism (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1958)).

Miliukov settled in St. Petersburg. The end of the century found the political movements in Russia in a feverish state of organization. Miliukov was first drawn into the circles of the neo-populists and even wrote in their periodical Russkoe bogatstvo (The Russian Wealth). He admitted that, although he could not agree with their program, he found their leaders rather congenial. Among these were Miakotin and Peshekhonov. The St. Petersburg intermezzo did not last long. Miliukov was again arrested for his speech during a memorial evening in honour of the deceased revolutionary P. L. Lavrov. After the release from prison he settled in a suburb of St. Petersburg, Udel'na, since the authorities forbad him to live in the city.

The beginning of the twentieth century marks Miliukov's active entry into the political life of the country. He found his place among radical liberals of the Russian intelligentsia. Here he wanted to steer a middle course between the Scylla of reaction and Charybdis of revolution. With the appearance of Osvobozhdenie (Liberation) in 1902, Miliukov became a regular contributor to the paper and on its pages expressed his views on the policy and aims of liberalism in Russia. It seems that the formation of views on the political and social questions underwent in Miliukov the historian a long evolutionary development. These views are discussed below.

The years from 1903 till January 1905 find Miliukov mostly outside Russia. Invited to lecture on Russian history and the contemporary problems of Russia at the University of Chicago and the Lowell Institute in Boston, Miliukov left for the United

States. Here he met with Professor F. J. Turner and was greatly impressed by the American historian. The lectures were later published in a book form entitled Russia and its Crisis. The preparation for the American engagement involved the study of the English language which Miliukov approached with characteristic thoroughness. The American lectures proved successful for Miliukov and he was invited to come and lecture again in the winter of 1904-1905. This time the topic was to be the Balkans. Meanwhile the liberal Union of Liberation was formed and Miliukov became one of its members. Within a short time he was to play there an important part.

In 1904 Miliukov succeeded to complete in London the third part of Ocherki. The London sojourn gave him also a chance to meet with the new type of English liberalism. He was reassured, he said, by what he had seen in England and returned to Russia with renewed hopes that this kind of liberalism which recognized the importance of social reforms was workable for Russia as well. The events of Bloody Sunday (January 9, 1905) brought Miliukov home from the United States where he had lectured at the University of Chicago. He returned to Russia in January 1905 to become 'overnight' a political leader. Professor Karpovich in his article "Miliukov and Maklakov Two Types of Russian Liberalism"[3] expresses the view that Miliukov became a political leader almost in spite of himself. Miliukov himself thus comments on the change in his career:

---

[3]E. J. Simmons, Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 134.

> ...having lost the reputation of a novice - historian, I was returning home as a novice politician. I have never aspired to change from an historian into a politician but it so happened because it became an urgent demand of the time. I could be happy that in my case my observation of life of progressive democracies went hand in hand with the premises borne out from the study of the Russian history.[4]

The year 1905 marks the growing importance of Miliukov as the leader of the Constitutional Democratic Party which was organized in October. His type of left-winged liberalism won in the program of the party and in its tactics up and until the dismissal of the First Duma in July 1906. It was based on the hopes of cooperation with the left in order to bring the overthrow of autocracy. The Vyborg Manifesto drafted after the dismissal of the Duma by Miliukov, which was in fact an appeal to the people, failed and marked the defeat of Miliukov's most cherished hopes to draw behind his party the masses of the people.

Elected into the third and fourth Duma, Miliukov became the leader of the opposition. He and his party moved to the right and in 1915 the creation of the Progressive Block uniting them with the rightist parties took place. During the first World War Miliukov and his party agreed to support the war effort of the government. The growing abuses of the administration brought harsh criticism on the part of the opposition which was voiced by Miliukov in the Duma. In one of his addresses he accused the government of treason. In 1916 he led the deputation to England and France with a purpose to strengthen the ties of the alliance.

During the February Revolution of 1917 Miliukov seems to have contributed more than anybody else to the formation of the

---

[4]Miliukov, Vospominaniia, Vol. I, p. 255.

Provisional Government and was de facto the head of it. He held in the Provisional Government the post of Minister for Foreign Affairs. He and his party wanted to bring Russia safely to the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, which had to decide the future of Russia's form of government. Meanwhile Miliukov committed the new government to the principle of constitutional monarchy, a step which was considered suicidal for him and his party. As to the foreign policy of his country Miliukov believed that Russia had to remain in the alliance and continue the war. Severely criticized by the leftist parties, Miliukov was forced to resign in May 1917 and his resignation marked the first crisis in the Provisional Government. In the later stages of the revolution he tried to bring about an agreement between Kornilov and Kerenskii, and advised the choice of General Alekseev as the head of the government. In 1918 he participated in the party conference in Ekaterinograd. After the Armistice he went to England and France where he pleaded before the allies for greater support in the fight against the Bolsheviks. Despairing the struggle he settled in Paris where he continued with unabated vigor his political and scholarly work. He founded the Russian Democratic Organization and edited the periodicals New Russia and later Poslednie novosti (Latest News). Among the important works written by Miliukov during his emigre years are: The History of the Second Russian Revolution in three volumes, Russia's Catastrophe in two volumes, Histoire de Russie in three volumes, written in cooperation with Professors Ch. Seignobos and L. Eisenmann, and La politique exterieure des Soviets. Revised editions of his Outlines of

Russian Culture appeared in 1930 and in 1937. His Vospominaniia (Memoirs) were published posthumously in New York in 1955. Miliukov died in France in 1943; he was eighty four years old.

CHAPTER II

PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

> Each age tries to form its own conception of the past. Each age writes the history of the past anew - with reference to the conditions uppermost in its own time. Historians have accepted the doctrine of Herder. Society grows. They have accepted the doctrine of Comte. Society is an organism. The whole mode and manner of looking at things alters with every age.
>
> - F. J. Turner, "The Significance of History"

Paul Nikolaevich Miliukov came to intellectual maturity in the seventies of the last century when the prevalent current in historical thought was the positivist philosophy of August Comte. The aim of the positivists was to introduce into the study of society the same scientific observation of the laws which prevail in physics, chemistry and physiology. Comte constructed an elaborate system of a new science which he called sociology. He held that "all human phenomena are sociological"[1] and are subject to laws like all other phenomena. History, said Comte, must teach us how social life has developed humanity. And so Comte's sociology is a science of humanity considered in its evolution. "Its task is to analyze the past of humanity that it may find in it the interpretation of its present, and a rational prevision of its future."[2]

---

[1]L. Levy-Bruhl, Philosophy of August Comte (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1903), p.234.

[2]Ibid. p. 259.

Miliukov was first introduced to the writings of Comte and Mill in one of the cultural circles of high school students he belonged to. Works of these philosophers made a deep impression upon the young student. After graduation, Miliukov entered the Moscow University where his interests seemed to have centred first around the science of linguistics and the history of the primitive man. At the same time he read extensively the works of Hume, Locke and Kant, and under the influence and inspiration of Professor Vinogradov became interested in history. He spent the summer of 1879 at the country estate of Prince Dolgoruki, and already then tried to formulate his own ideas on the philosophy of history. He had read the works of positivist historians such as Taine, Burckhardt and Michelet and had studied Spencer. He knew Comte's positivist philosophy well. Miliukov admits that although he accepted Comte's ideas of the three stages of the historical process, the theological, metaphysical and positivist, he maintained that "these stages are not developing simultaneously in universal history, but differ in time in each individual national organism."[3] The study of the individual national organisms and the application to those of the comparative method had to lead to the framing of general sociological laws. Miliukov left his construction of a philosophy of history incomplete when he discovered that there were "several links missing."[4] One thing, however, remained from this period. His preoccupation with the

---

[3]P. N. Miliukov, Vospominaniia (New York: Izdatelstvo Chekhova, 1955), Vol. I, p. 86.

[4]<u>Ibid.</u> p. 88.

philosophy of Comte became known, and many have ever since considered him a Comtian. Miliukov however qualified this opinion. "Positivist", he said, "would be more appropriate since I took from Comte not so much his philosophical system as his scientific direction."[5]

He became an avowed positivist. Narrative history, mere relation of facts, was discarded by the generation he belonged to. "We awaited from history something different, something that would bring it closer to experimental sciences."[6] His choice was the history of human society in all its aspects, social, economic, institutional and cultural. This new approach to the writing of history Miliukov wanted to apply to Russian history. Patriotic allegiance, the influence of the renowned professor of Russian history, W. O. Kliuchevskii, as well as practical reasons, accounted for his decision to choose the history of Russia as his main field of study. A great deal of archival material not yet touched by historians was available in Russia and Miliukov decided to make use of this material.

The philosophy of history which the young Miliukov tried to formulate in 1879 appeared crystalized by and large when he wrote Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury (Outlines of Russian Culture) thirteen years later. In the short prefaces to this work he explained his views on history. These views became the basis for his historical works and political preoccupation.

Philosophy of history in the sense of teleological

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid. p. 90.

explanation of historical events appears to Miliukov to be "one of the few vestiges of a long discarded world outlook."[7] All historical processes are governed by certain laws. Although history is unable to discover these sought-for laws the existence of these laws ought to be assumed even if these would never be discovered. "For the historical phenomena are to such a degree complex that it is natural to doubt the existence of particular historical laws."[8]

In analyzing the historical process Miliukov discerns three main groups of conditions that make this process possible. The first is the inner basic sociological tendency of evolution inherent in any society. It gives to the historical development of different societies a character of similarity in their basic course of evolution. Taken by itself this inner tendency constitutes only an abstract potentiality. For its development a certain material environment is necessary. The second condition lies in the peculiarities of that material environment in which a given society is developing. The variations in the environment are the cause of the differentiation of the separate historical processes. The influence upon the historical process of an individual personality constitutes the third condition. The role that a personality plays in the historical process brings into it the element of chance. The role becomes greater if the action of an individual is directed towards the evolving historical

---

[7]P. N. Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury (St. Petersburg, 1896), Vol. II, Part I, p. 5.

[8]Ibid. p. 7.

process, and it is then that the individual earns the title "great". "The individual personality as an expression or fulfilment of the needs of the moment becomes omnipotent."[9]

Monist in a limited sense, Miliukov acknowledged the fact of strict laws that govern history but he did not accept the idea of the rule of matter over spirit as the marxists, and asserted that "the scientific synthesis in sociology annuls the antithesis of the spiritual and material beginning."[10] Institutions, economy, mode of life are the products of spirit just as much as art and religion. It might be said, continued Miliukov, that the process of human evolution is being achieved under the impulse of necessity to adapt oneself to the surrounding environment. But the relations towards the environment are not limited by economic needs. "To the human mind the relations appear to such an extent diverse that it is impossible for the historian to bring them to some kind of elementary unity."[11] The spiritual and the material are not subordinated to each other. They appear parallel in their development. The spiritual processes as well as the material are governed by laws.

Comte built his study of stages of human progress on the principle of world history. He assigned the stage of fetishism and polytheism to primitive and ancient societies; monotheism and metaphysics to the Middle Ages and to the beginning of modern times, the nineteenth century he regarded as positivistic-scientific, the development of which lies in the future. Miliukov

---

[9] Ibid. p. 17.

[10] Ibid., Vol. I (Jubilee edition, Paris, 1937), p. 8.

[11] Ibid., Vol. II (St. Petersburg, 1896), p. 5.

maintains that the units of historical study are not arbitrarily divided ages but real and easily identifiable national organisms (civilizations). These separate national organisms Miliukov does not regard as immovable or immutable types. "Scientific sociology is concerned with the evolution of every separate organism and finds in this evolution features similar to those of other organisms."[12] In his further attempt to fulfill the main idea of sociology, that of framing laws, Miliukov asserts that scientific sociology extracts the common traits of evolution of these separate organisms into regular sociological categories, and tries to discover the mutual dependence between these categories.

Like many other historians of the nineteenth century he rediscovered the early eighteenth century Italian philosopher and historian Giambattista Vico. Miliukov took from the Italian historian the idea of "corsi e ricorsi" which in Miliukov's outlook replaced the concept of the straight line development of history. The idea of "corsi e ricorsi" was Vico's belief that history passed through a cycle of fixed phases but in his conception it was not a circle but a spiral, for "history never repeats itself but comes round to each new phase in a form differentiated by what has gone before."[13] Vico also denied the premise prevalent at his time (and at later times as well) that when two nations have a similar idea or a similar institution, one must have learned it from the other. He showed that this assertion

---

[12] Ibid., Vol. I (Jubilee edition, Paris, 1930), p. 14.

[13] R. G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 68-69.

denies the creative power of the human mind which can rediscover ideas for itself without learning them from the other, and "in case of one nation teaching the other, the learner can only learn the lessons for which its previous historical development has prepared it."[14] Miliukov accepted this idea and later used it as a weapon against the nationalistic interpretation of Russian history.

If one is to look for the various "isms" in Miliukov's philosophy of history he will find the term "scientific realism". Discussing the works of Boltin[15] Miliukov mentions the fact that "now that 'scientific realism' became the slogan of historical study there is a greater affinity of some of our historians with Boltin, who tried to interpret Russian history as one whole organic process."[16] Another "ism" used by Miliukov is "economic materialism" which was not to be confused with "philosophical materialism" of Marx. He was an economic materialist in a limited sense of the term, and believed that the economic factor was only seemingly determined by the material. He considered the philosophy of economic materialism a "temporary expedient the idea of which was important in that it served as a means to clear sociology from the last vestiges of metaphysical explanations."[17]

Miliukov expressed his views on the task of the nineteenth century historian when he compared his own work with that of

---

[14] Ibid. [15] Boltin (1735-1792), a Russian historian.

[16] P. N. Miliukov, Glavnye techeniia russkoi istoricheskoi mysli (Moskva, 1897), p. 53.

[17] Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury, Vol. II, Part II, p. 4.

Schlötzer.[18] "Schlötzer's idea was a historical narrative; ours is sociological law. Schlötzer's work ends with the establishment of a fact, ours begins after the fact has been established."[19] History then is the concrete science, it is only the first stage, that of the fact collecting. the second stage belongs to sociology[20] - the abstract science. History and sociology are for Miliukov not two divorced scientific fields. History is "concrete sociology", and it has to concern itself with these phenomena to which both "measure and number" can be applied. These phenomena have to be arranged in such order that the ideas of law-governed history would be apparent. Full explanation of facts is important to the historian. But is it also important to a sociologist? Miliukov answers the question saying that "every fact large or small might be helpful to discover a permanent causal connection of events and is therefore important."[21] As to causes of historical processes he does not recognize the division into primary or secondary causes. From the scientific point of view there are no primary or secondary causes. There are only causes, and it is impossible to assert a priori which are more important. There are only causes with a wider or narrower range of action.[22]

The basis of Miliukov's historical research is always a

---

[18]A. Schlötzer (1735-1809), a German historian, published a list of Russian chronicles, wrote Das neue veränderte Russland und allgemeine nordische Geschichte.

[19]Miliukov, Glavnye techeniia russkoi istoricheskoi mysli, p. 66.

[20] Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury, Vol. II, Part I, p. 5.

[21]Ibid. p. 16. [22]Ibid. p. 14.

document or a fact; means by which he proceeds is logic, and the guiding principle his scientific outlook. One of the main characteristics of his work is the extraordinary use that he makes of primary sources. The best example is his magistral dissertation Gosudarstvennoe khoziaistvo Rossii v pervoi chetverti XVIII stoletiia i reforma Petra Velikogo (State Economics of Russia in the First Quarter of the 18th Century and the Reform of Peter the Great). To support his thesis Miliukov unearthed a great deal of documents from the Moscow state archives. One of them was the first Russian state budget which was never used by any former historian. In 1904 while on a visit to the United States Miliukov delivered a lecture before the American Historical Association on the topic "The Chief Currents of Russian Historical Thought". He mentioned there "inter alia" that a new current of thought and research was in the process of development in Russia. He called it "the sociological stage of the organic view of history."[23] He was himself, it seems an outstanding representative of this "sociological stage".

Miliukov accepted Comte's theory of the three stages of development of the human society, but rejected its universalism. He put forward instead the idea that each national organism passes these stages individually. Russia, he thought, could not be an exception. Thus he saw the possibility for Russia to enter the path of liberalism irrespective of her past.

---

[23] P. N. Miliukov, "The Chief Currents of Russian Historical Thought" American Historical Association Annual Report for 1904 (p. 109-114).

CHAPTER III

CRITIQUE OF SLAVOPHILE HISTORIOGRAPHY

> I admitted one truth in the assertions of the populists and their forerunners the Slavophiles. I admitted the great peculiarity of the Russian historical process. But first of all I did not consider this peculiarity immutable or irresolvable. And in the natural and historical conditions that created this peculiarity I did not perceive any guarantee of a special potentiality of the Russian culture.
>
> - P. N. Miliukov, "Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury"

The preoccupation with Russia's past and present and her perspective of further development was a distinctive feature of the Russian intelligentsia of the nineteenth century. Owing to closer contact with Europe, the contrast between Russia and the West came out more strikingly into the foreground. The question arose, "why did the Russian historical process develop as it did?" Two main characteristics of the Russian historical process were noted. These were its "extreme primitiveness and its peculiarity."[1] They lay as a basis for two divergent views on the development of Russia's history. The first view held by the so called Westerners maintained that the only difference between Russia and Europe was the slowness in the development of the former, and that in the future process of growth Russia will pass through the same stages that Europe has passed before or is passing through

---

[1]P. N. Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury, (St. Petersburg, 1897), Vol. II, Part I, p. 216.

now. The Westerners insisted on the sameness of Russia with Europe. This group was the 'spiritual ancestor' of the future liberal democratic groups. The other view, that of the Slavophiles, developed on the premises of the peculiarity and immutability of Russia's history and was brought to the extreme by such representatives of this movement as Danilevskii and Leont'ev. On one hand, Miliukov maintained, the ideas of the Slavophiles became the gospel of the movement of the populists. On the other, these ideas as propounded by Danilevskii and Leont'ev were adopted by the government, which in trying to hold on the old order found in this doctrine its ideological justification.

Miliukov took a middle road between these two theories. He based his approach to Russian history on his philosophy of history and on a thorough analysis of the Russian historical process. "The Westerners", in his opinion, "disregarded the influence of the material environment and of the historical circumstances."[2] In the interpretation of the Slavophiles was inherent the "unwillingness to analyze the historical result and regard it as one indivisible whole."[3] According to their views three main factors shaped Russia's historical process. These were: Nationality, Orthodoxy and Autocracy. They were regarded as peculiar to Russia and immutable. Miliukov disagreed with this interpretation. A strong believer in evolution he refused to accept the idea of immutability asserting that "nothing in modern science is unalterable"[4] and refuted the accusation that

---

[2]Ibid. p. 218. [3]Ibid.

[4]P. N. Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1906), p. 30.

whatever was new in Russia was "borrowed" and foreign. He insisted that "the Russian nation is itself European and the process of modelling originated in Russia as much as elsewhere in Europe in internal evolutionary causes and not in fanciful borrowing."[5] By confronting the nationalistic conception of Russian history with the real process of evolution of Russia's political, religious and national life Miliukov set out to prove the fallacy of the nationalistic point of view. He thought of a national type as of a sociological product that possesses certain characteristics which can be taught and untaught. In analyzing the Russian national type he did not see anything unique in it. For the only outstanding feature of the Russian character he regarded its adaptability and plasticity. He found confirmation of this point of view even in the opinion of such a prominent representative of the Russian nationalists as the writer Dostoevskii: "The Russian character is in high degree endowed with a capacity for synthesis - with the talent for a universal reconciliation with an all humanness."[6]

Nationality is for Miliukov a product not the substance of the historical process. His scientific realism denies the idea of "substance" which, like the concept of "thing in itself", is metaphysical. Miliukov distinguishes three stages of development of the nationalistic idea. The first stage, that of instinctive nationalism, was characteristic of Russia's ancient history and it remained by and large unchanged in all but the upper layers of the Russian society. The second stage, that of

---

[5] Ibid. p. 29. [6] Ibid. p. 17.

self-assertion developed during the political unification of Russia in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. As a result of closer contact with the outside world in the seventeenth century, the third stage of the development of the nationalistic idea ensued. In this stage the nationalistic idea became subject to criticism and comparison with higher cultures. Therein two trends became apparent. One was messianic and cosmopolitan, the other was particular and reactionary.

In the seventeenth century Russia came into closer contact with the western culture brought in by foreign settlers. The new influences were looked upon with suspicion by the clergy and the state. Tsar Alexis tried to separate the old from the new and ordered the foreigners into separate quarters. The "old" was the Greek tradition that gave Russia her religion. The "new" was the German influence which was to give Russia her culture. The expression of this conflict between the old and the new is found in the book "Politics" written by a Croatian writer Krizhanich who settled in Russia and because of his views was later exiled to Siberia.

> ...The Germans wish to poison us with their novelties; but then the Greeks inconsiderately condemn whatever is new. The Germans propose to teach us true science, but they mix it with the art of the devil; on the other hand the Greeks count as heresy every bit of knowledge, and advise us to remain in complete ignorance.[7]

Krizhanich advised to choose a middle course between the extremes, "according to the dictates of reason."

The western influence became stronger with the accession

---

[7]P. N. Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury (Jubilee edition, Paris, 1930), Vol. III, p. 137.

of Peter. Miliukov, in his book The State Economics of Russia in the First Quarter of the XVIII Century and the Reforms of Peter the Great, tried to prove that the reform came as a result of previous development of Russia and was not something imposed on by the will of one man. Peter's reforms and the Petrine period in Russian history was regarded as a crucial point by the Westerners and the Slavophiles. Both considered the reforms as revolutionary. One school lauded Peter for opening Russia to western influences, the other condemned him for the break that the reforms caused in the political and religious tradition of Russia. Miliukov in his interpretation of the reforms followed his teachers and predecessors Kliuchevskii and Solovev, who maintained that the reform was not a "revolution" but rather a "shock", and that it was already prepared in the seventeenth century. While his predecessors emphasized in the reforms the cultural side in the limited sense of the word, Miliukov turned to the material aspect of these and based his thesis on a thorough investigation of the economic, financial, social and institutional factors. He began from ascertainment of the reasons for the financial organization of the country in the seventeenth century, and gave account of the influence of this financial system upon the people as well as of the changes that the system necessitated in the governmental institutions. He further explained how the financial difficulties, caused primarily by the foreign policy of Peter, were dealt with by the government and what effect this had upon the population. He maintained that the reaction of the people to the measures taken by the government brought the destruction of the old institutions and the introduction of the

new. At the beginning the reforms were introduced in a haphazard way, without an a priori conceived plan. Only at a later stage the element of plan and consideration was evident. And yet till the end of Peter's rule the reforms hardly suited the Russian reality, and appeared to be the result of concurrence of circumstances that often found the reformer unprepared. Although closely connected with the previous development of the Russian state, the reforms bore a strong imprint of the personality of Peter and of the immediate needs of the day. Russia entered the ranks of the European states to the detriment of her economic development. The reforms caused a break in Russia's nationalistic tradition. The masses did not accept the new ideas. For the nobility and the gentry the acceptance of foreign customs became a mark of social distinction, and a wide gap was formed between the two classes of population.

The next step in the development of the nationalistic idea took place in the eighteenth century when the problem of relationship between Russsia and Europe was raised by the educated circles centred around the institutes of higher learning. The government was interested in preventing the foreign influence to penetrate into Russia. For the first time an attempt was made to construct a nationalistic theory. Boltin, a Russian historian of the eighteenth century, built his theory on the assumption that the Russians were different and peculiar. The reasons for the differences, said Boltin, may be found in the theory of Montesquieu of the influence of climate and outward conditions on the formation of a national type. There was, however, nothing in the theory of

Boltin to prove the superiority of the Russian people over the other peoples. Miliukov maintained that the nationalistic theory was the work of the nineteenth century romanticists.[8] Thus, the theory itself was "borrowed" from the West. In Russia the romantic view of nationality found adherents amongsts the students of the Moscow University. These intellectuals of the second quarter of the nineteenth century, Miliukov continues, carried further the ideas of Hegel. They thought that the future belonged to the Slavs whose task was to bring to the world the true religion. The Slavophiles as these intellectuals were soon to be called, lauded Eastern Christianity as the only religion that went "the way of feeling." The West erred, they maintained, because the Roman Catholic Church has forsaken the collective feeling of the church for individual judgement in religious matters. Reformation was the next step towards individualism, which led to atheism and revolution.[9] None of these developments took place in Russia where the religion was that of love and humility. The material manifestation of Christian love was the peasant commune.[10]

---

[8]The creators of the romantic theory of nationality, Fichte and Hegel in Germany, De Bonald and De Maistre in France, asserted that every nation has its own particular idea which it is predestined to realize. This "idea" forms the essence of the nation, of its "spirit", that constitutes the very core of the nation. It is unchangeable and the durability of the very existence of a nation depends on its "spirit". Hegel, in his Philosophy of History maintained that there was a place assigned in the scheme of things to every historical nation worthy of representing some special ideas. See also N. V. Riasanovsky, Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1952).

[9]P. N. Miliukov, Is istorii russkoi intelligentsii (St. Petersburg, 1902), p. 268.

[10]Ibid.

Christian love and landed peasant community were the "particular ideas" that the Russians and their brethren were to bring mankind.

The further development of the Slavophile ideology Miliukov found in the second half of the nineteenth century. With the advancement of natural science new trends appeared in historical thought. Universal history was replaced by the idea that all phenomena have to be explained by its own native forces - not by final causes that lay outside of it.[11] In Russia, Danilevskii and Leont'ev constructed a particular and reactionary nationalistic theory. Danilevskii, a natural scientist, wrote the book Russia and Europe. He maintained there that Russia and Europe are two worlds inhabited by "different" national types as different as zoological species. These national types are peculiar and unique and no transmission of culture from one type to another is possible. "One national type created the English constitution, the other the Slavic commune."[12] Thus, concluded Danilevskii, Russia has to live only on whatever the Slavic types of culture has had in itself since the beginning of her existence. Her task is to unite the Slavs under her leadership and to make Constantinople the centre of the Slavic federation.[13]

Leont'ev, a Russian consul in the Near East, brought in his writings the nationalistic history "ad absurdum". According to his views the other Slavs were lost because of their European contagion. "The Russians", said Leont'ev, "were threatened with the same contagion of liberty and equality."[14] As a matter of

---

[11] Ibid. p. 268. [12] Ibid. p. 274.

[13] Ibid. p. 273. [14] Ibid. p. 284.

fact Leont'ev did not find any genuine Russian culture. The Russian Church and the State were of Byzantine origin. "Russia owes all she has to Byzantium, even her future."[15] He concluded that Russian peculiarity did not consist in the creation of the new, but rather in the preservation of the old. It is therefore "imperative to freeze Russia, so that she will be preserved in her present form till better times come."[16] This, Miliukov explained, was the last word of the nationalistic theory; it became the basis of the actual policy of the Russian government at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. There was, however, one more attempt to find the way out of this reactionary nationalism made by the philosopher and theologian W. S. Solovev. According to his ideology "Russia's mission was to give political power to the universal form of Christianity"[17] which for him was the Catholic Church. The political power was necessary for "the salvation of the Roman Catholic religion and for the rebirth of Europe and the world."[18] Miliukov, by showing the evolutionary development of the nationalistic idea, disproved its immutability. He found that there was nothing specifically different in the Russian national type and that there was nothing original nor peculiarly Russian in the idea. Miliukov proceeded to analyze the development of the Orthodoxy and Autocracy, since these were regarded particularly Russian and also immutable. Miliukov considered Orthodoxy a Russian adaptation of Eastern Christianity. Although he agreed that the Eastern Church was

---

[15] Ibid. [16] Ibid. [17] Ibid. p. 297.

[18] Ibid.

more philosophical and speculative than the Church of the West, he maintained that this was true of the early Eastern Church. By the time Russia received Christianity the doctrine became static and no further development of the doctrine was to be tolerated. It preserved many archaic features of primitive Christianity such as undeveloped form of sacraments, divine service in the vernacular, unsystematized theology and uncentralized hierarchy. The Russian Church was not speculative like the Oriental Churches of the first centuries. It was oriental only to the extent that it was old fashioned in ritual and stationary in dogma. Russia adopted the oriental dogma to her former pagan creed. The simiplified and materialized oriental creed became the national type of Russian Orthodoxy.[19] The Russian people were ignorant of the Christian doctrine and the rites constituted the most important part of their religious life. Thus, the Russian Orthodoxy became "the religion of continuous ringing of bells, fasts, services and innumerable bowings and crossings before the icons."[20]

At the beginning the Russian religious tradition developed slowly and there existed a great dependency upon the Greek Church. The period from 1204 till 1453 marks a continuous progress towards fuller emancipation of the Russian Church. The fall of Constantinople was considered by the Russian Church as a punishment brought upon the Greeks for their acceptance of the union with the Catholic Church.[21] During this time an important development in

---

[19]Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 67.

[20]Ibid. p. 72. See also Miliukov, "Russia", Athenaeum (July 2, 1892).

[21]The Union of Florence in 1439.

the Russian religious tradition took place. The theory of Moscow becoming the third Rome was then created. Philotheus, a learned monk, in a letter written by him to Ivan III, formulated this theory: "...look her now, and listen, O thou pious Tsar; Christian realms have all converged into thine, the only one; two Romes have fallen; the third stands upright, and there is no fourth to come."[22] Further development in the establishment of the National Church took place during the sixteenth century. Russian theologians began to look for differences between the Greek, and the Russian creeds and found their own superior. In 1547 and in 1549, they canonized their own saints. At the end of the century the Russian Church became autocephalic.

Scarcely a century later, said Miliukov, this religious tradition was destroyed by the State. As a result of Nikon's reforms came the schism followed by the full secularization of the Church and with the establishment of the Holy Synod it became subservient to the autocratic power of the State. The population was divided into three groups: the adherents of the official Church, the Old Believers, and the ignorant masses of the population who saw their allegiance to the Old Believers rather than to the Church of Nikon. The affiliation with the official Church was often a matter of expediency for people who in virtue of their position had to belong to the Church they had little feeling for. The result of it was a growing religious indifference amongst the upper classes of the population. In its later development the Russian Church lost its moral influence over the religious life

---

[22]Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 75.

of the nation. Among other reasons was the low moral and material status of the parish priest. "Religion became an instrument by which the instructed classes governed the illiterate crowd."[23]

An important place in Miliukov's study of Russian religious tradition occupies the movement of sectarianism. In this movement he wants to find another proof of Russia's affinity with the rest of Europe. "Thus, against the belief and assertion of the Russian nationalists who preserve the conviction that orthodox religion is indestructible quality in the national soul - comes the movement of sectarianism."[24] The Russian Nationalists blamed the foreign influence for this development of religious thought. Miliukov agreed that "there was foreign influence, but it worked along the line of an inner process of religious development."[25] Miliukov did not consider Orthodoxy immutable or superior. He emphasized the foreign influence upon the Russian religious tradition and hoped that religious freedom and tolerance would come to Russia "as the negation of the ancient religious tradition of Russia."[26] The peculiar features of Russian Orthodoxy were in his eyes a result of a historical process, neither unchanging nor unchangeable.

The nationalistic interpretation of Russian history stressed the role of Autocracy in the Russian political tradition. It thought of autocracy as a peculiar Russian institution that had to be preserved. Miliukov did not consider autocracy inherent in the Russian character. He saw the political tradition of Russia

---

[23] Ibid. p. 91. [24] Ibid. p. 24.

[25] Ibid. p. 101. [26] Ibid. p. 130.

developing on the lines similar to those of Western Europe; at the same time he did not deny the peculiarities of Russian political tradition; he sought, however, the causes of these in the outward conditions, and contended that even among the Western European states the political development had not followed one set pattern.[27] He found that autocracy in Russia came as a result of a long evolutionary process and was established in the fifteenth century by the Moscow princes.[28]

Miliukov first tried to explain the political development of Russia in terms of sociology. Accordingly, he discerns three consecutive stages of political organization. The first stage is the tribal society followed by the feudal state and later by the national-military state. From the latter evolved the contemporary constitutional state. This pattern is not uniform in the different countries and the evolutionary process of the political organization seems to be "more backward and less intense as one advances from the Atlantic seaboard to the Ural mountains."[29] The same process of growth from the tribal to the feudal stage which took place in the fifth and sixth centuries on the Loire appeared only in the seventh and eighth centuries on the Rhine and only in the thirteenth century in Lithuania. In sociological terms, explained Miliukov, the reason for the retardedness of the process lay in the "lack of inner springs of development,"[30] which in this case was the social differentiation within the tribe, and the growth of local aristocracy. Only when the local tribal families assume leadership

---

[27] Ibid. p. 134. [28] Ibid. p. 511.

[29] Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 134.

[30] Ibid.

over the tribe and begin to build up great landlords estates occurs the transition to the second stage, that of feudalism. Sometimes an outside factor such as war or commerce supplies the inner springs, if these are missing, and leads to social differentiation within the tribe and to feudal power. If the factors come from without the second stage assumes a different form.

Miliukov points out that Russia provides history with such an example. The political power came from without and appropriated the right over the land. This central political power assumed military functions over the territory and soon developed into autocracy. Characteristic to the Russian political organization was also the factor of colonization. "The prince and his men were usually the first settlers"[31] and had no difficulty in appropriating unoccupied lands. In fact this happened in one part of Russia, where no uniform development of political organization took place and separate independent states existed from the ninth till the sixteenth century. One of the earliest organized states was the South Western state with Kiev as its centre. Later in some parts of its former territories the "secondary"[32] southern state developed which was strongly influenced by Polish feudalism. In the North grew into power the merchant republics of Pskow and Novgorod. At the end, the Moscovite state prevailed and Miliukov explains this phenomenon to have happened in accordance with the law of the "survival of the fittest."[33] Because of the lands it controlled, the state had the means to organize a superior military

---

[31]Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury, Vol. II, Part I, p. 114.

[32]Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 146.

[33]Ibid. p. 550.

force and meet the needs of defence. With the exception of the secondary south western state there was no feudal stage in the development of Russia's political organization. Miliukov mentions the work of his friend Pavlov-Sylvanskii,[34] who tried to prove the existence of feudalism in Russia on a large scale but because of the available evidence, Miliukov finds the attempt unconvincing. North east Russia possessed a kind of feudal land tenure. Lands were granted for court service; besides there were hereditary land holdings called "fathers holdings". The Moscovite prince, however, had no feudal princes on the European model to contend with. The organization of the state was patterned after the Eastern example. Lands were given in exchange for service but were not hereditary.

At the end of the fifteenth century the unification of Russia took place under the leadership of the princes of Moscovy. The reforms of Ivan III in 1484 continued by Ivan IV laid the basis for the autocratic rule. The class of hereditary land owners, the boyars, was destroyed and a new class of courtiers replaced the old nobility. Autocracy seemed well entrenched. In order to become a tradition, however, it had to change from a mere historical fact into an idea. Miliukov stresses here again the foreign influence. The idea of autocracy was introduced by South Slav refugees who escaped from the Turkish rule and came to Moscow with hopes that the Moscow prince would help in the liberation of their countries. Moscow, as in religious, so in political life, was to become the third Rome, and a pedigree established artificially

---

[34]Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury, Vol. I, Part I, p. 29.

made Ivan III the descendant of Augustus.[35] Ivan IV was crowned with pseudo Byzantine insignia and assumed the title tsar (from Caesar). The juridical basis, however, for autocracy was missing. There was a reference to the sanction of God, which could be extended to any form of political power.

During the reign of Peter the Great autocracy received its legal formula. Borrowed from the modern doctrine of "natural law" it had no connection with the previous tradition. According to this law the rulers were delegates of the people deriving their power by common consent - a "social contract" of the nation. This theory was acknowledged in the official writings of the archbishop Prokopovitch who wrote: "Every form of government has its origin in an initial mutual agreement among people."[36] The task of the ruler was to care for the common good of his people though in the case of misuse of the power he was responsible only to God. Miliukov saw another attempt to construct a theory of autocracy in Catherine's II assertion of the philosophical justification of the Russian political organization. The Empress, influenced by the philosophy of Montesquieu, claimed that the size of Russia warranted an autocratic regime. In the nineteenth century further development of Russia's political tradition occured when Alexander I made a step forward toward the establishment of legal monarchy. He failed for lack of support and soon abandoned the idea of a constitution he was inclined to give Russia at the beginning of his reign. The only institution brought into existence was the

---

[35]Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 165.

[36]Ibid. p. 169.

Council of the State.

Miliukov asserted that autocracy remained a material fact. He did not regard autocracy as a peculiarly Russian institution. During the four centuries of its existence the idea of autocracy was constantly changing, and the foreign influences were very obvious. From an institution inherited from the "forefathers" it changed into a theocratic institution and later into a bureaucratic monarchy on European lines, again from a bureaucratic state into an enlightened absolute monarchy, and finally into a national institution sanctioned by the mere fact of its long existence and by its supposed quality of immutability. Since no legal and moral tradition of autocracy can be found to exist claimed Miliukov "nothing is opposed to its overthrow except the fact of its existence and power to preserve it."[37] Despite the lack of a well established political tradition autocracy remained the ruling force. Miliukov regretted Speranskii's[38] abortive attempt to bring about a change in the political organization of Russia. The government, he asserts, had a free choice and how different the situation in Russia might have been if the government would have followed Speranskii's advice.[39] The government had a free choice of action because no social forces existed in Russia that could have compelled it to implement a program of political and social reforms.

The analysis of the social structure of the Russian society is of particular interest, if one bears in mind the idea

---

[37] Ibid. p. 552. [38] Ibid. p. 174

[39] Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 555.

that Miliukov later tried to prove that a constitutional government was very near to reality in Russia on the pattern of the Western European states, in spite of the fact that the basic social structure of the Russian society was so much different. Miliukov points out that the cause of the lack of organized and strong social forces was economic. "The process of settlement in Russia was slow, the density of population was small and the economic development retarded."[40] Agriculture, except for the central parts, developed very slowly and the cultivation of land was primitive. Industry was limited to domestic industry while the big industries were created artificially by the government. Trade and commerce were in the hands of foreigners, the inland trade was in a primitive stage of development. The backward economic structure retarded the process of social differentiation and of the establishment of distinguished social classes. While in Europe the social structure conditioned the political organization, in Russia the state had a great influence upon the formation of the social structure. The European society was built up as if from the inside and developed from the lower to higher stages (steps). The basis of the European society was the peasantry which was by and large settled between the sixth and eighth centuries. The Middle Ages saw the emergence of the feudal aristocracy powerful because of its land holdings. In the modern period came the formation of the strong state. In Russia, asserted Miliukov, the social classes with the exception of the Kiev Russia were built up from above. In the North Eastern State the prince was usually the

---

[40] Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury, Vol. II, Part I, p. 214.

first settler and around him everything was in a continuous flux. Out of the small circle of his servants developed the military class of the Russian society. The basis of the social structure, the peasantry, remained unsettled. At a later date, the peasants became "glebae adscripti".

The Russian state, did not have to fight the privileges of the social classes, on the contrary it was interested in "the formation of such classes in order to use them later for its own aims."[41] Its task was easier because the slow growth of material interests failed to bring about the crystalization of the distinctive social groups, a thing that long appeared in the West, where it came as a result of fierce economic struggle. At the same time the outward conditions compelled the state to organize a strong military power. Means were needed for defence and these grew in great disproportion to the economic development of the country.[42] The organization of the Russian state developed under the growing need of more money and of a bigger army. Russia's tax policy was also a result of her economic backwardness and of the unproportionate growth of the state needs. These two factors accounted for the establishment of the first peasant commune and later of the city commune as well. Since the beginning of the social organization of Russia the social classes were put in a direct connection and dependence of the state power. Only in the South Western state the social structure bore resemblance to the states of Western Europe, where between the state and the people stood the feudal owner. Russian land-owning class was in the service

---

[41] Ibid. p. 115. [42] Ibid. p. 146.

of the prince and had limited power. The prince granted lands to his men in exchange for services given to him. These men formed a privileged class of the so called "Pomieshchiki". In contrast to Western Europe the uncultivated land in Russia was of little value and did not enhance the position of the landlord.

So much for the general observation of the development of the social classes, and the relationship between the social groups of population and the political organization, as Miliukov saw it. The various classes or groups of population underwent changes that weakened the status that they had reached in course of their growth. The tradition of the nobility as a distinguished social class was deliberately destroyed by the government. In contrast to West-European idea of peerage stood in Russia the system of seniority, which accounted for the lack of esprit de corps among the nobility and was a contributing factor in the weakening of this social class. The ancient aristocracy was crushed by Ivan IV in the sixteenth century; the second aristocracy that of state service was democratized by Peter the Great. The third aristocracy, that of courtiers of the eighteenth century was too dependent upon the government to form a real force. The gentry had little chance to become independent. In return for its service the gentry was granted lands and peasants. In the middle of the eighteenth century it seemed as if the gentry would be interested to affirm its social position through the use of political privileges. The government at that time did not need the gentry for military service and instead of political representation it was granted predominance in local government. Dissatisfied, the gentry considered the

newly acquired position as a stepping stone to state service and lost chances for obtaining political power.

The bourgeoisie, continued Miliukov was not to be found in Russia until recent times. As in the case of the other social groups the course ran differently than in Western Europe. The cause was the slow growth of the city. In Europe the development of the city was a result of the inner economic and industrial development of the society. The city emerged from the feudalism of the Middle Ages when it felt strong enough to withstand the pressure of feudal power. The city corporation accepted in its ranks more and more people guaranteeing their freedom; "The air of the city makes the man free."[43] During the ninth to thirteenth centuries the cities of Western Europe grew in power and importance and later partook in the making of the modern European state. In Russia the city was not a natural outgrowth of the inner economic development. It was at first an artificial creation of the government. Before needed by the people it was needed by the government for purposes of defense, as the name of city "gorod"[44] illustrates. It stood in direct dependence of the government to which it was subordinated. The city had to fulfill a double purpose; that of defense and taxation. The policy of the government and the slow economic growth of the country prevented the city element to develop into a strong social class. Miliukov contrasted the development of the local government of Russia with that of Europe

---

[43] Ibid. p. 177. (A popular saying quoted by Miliukov.)

[44] "Gorod" from the word "ogorodit" - to fence in, to enclose.

emphasizing the fact that the future political system of Europe owed much to the early growth of self-government. Such development did not take place in Russia until Peter the Great and Catherine began their efforts to organize the city elements and to give to its organization these elements of independence which were not developed by the Russian historical process. The city burgher was still subject to military service and had to pay high taxes. The privileges obtained seemed to the rich layer of the city dwellers only illusory and they used the first opportunity to enter another social class, namely that of the gentry. The third estate, the creation of which was Catherine's aim, did not materialize. Miliukov saw the progress in the evolution of the middle class only in the nineteenth century which, according to him, came as a result of rapid economic growth of the country. He emphasized that in Russia "the third estate developed from amongst various elements of Russia's past and in them begin to show the forces that created the cultural and political life of modern Europe, that of capital and education."[45]

Miliukov found in his analysis of Russia's social history that the social orders in Russia have always been subservient to the aims of the state. They have had no privileges except such as resulted from their state duties and these were given them by the state. This, said Miliukov, was particularly true of the period of the formation of the Moscovite state and of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. An attempt made to transform the social orders of Russia into a kind of privileged orders, like those of medieval

---

[45]Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury, Vol. II, Part I, p. 185.

Europe which was made in the eighteenth century, failed. The social orders lacked a tradition, they were constantly being built up and destroyed to suit the needs of the state. The change towards emancipation and independence was evident only in the nineteenth century.

In his analysis of the social economic structure of Russia Miliukov devoted much place to the commune, which was idealized and glorified by the Slavophiles and later by the populists. The commune according to their views was the germ of salvation for the whole of humanity. As it was the commune did not much resemble the ideals of the Russian nationalists, said Miliukov. It was poor and indigent and the elected aldermen of the village became a kind of lower police officials responsible to every authority but not to their own electors. He dwelled on its origin and tried to dispell the myth of it being a purely Russian institution. "The historical analysis does not consider the Russian commune an unchangeable historical phenomenon. In its essence the Russian commune is a compulsory organization."[46] Miliukov turned to the works of Fustel de Coulanges and Seebohm as well as to the book of Baden-Powell On the Village Communities in India. It appeared from these works that first the village communities were not so elementary as they were supposed to be, and second that the "origin of the commune was multiform."[47] He went on to say that in Russia the commune had evolved from these different forms under the influence of the state and landlord authority. Both worked in the same direction. In certain regions the commune developed in the fourteenth century, in

---

[46] Ibid. P. 188.

[47] Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 349.

others it came into existence as late as in the eighteenth century. The reason for the similar socio-economic mode of life of the peasant communities lay in the fact that it was regulated from above. The general causes of the growth of the peasant commune, Miliukov insisted, "were the economic backwardness and the ever growing financial demands of the state."[48] Free ownership of land could not secure for the government punctual payment of taxes. on the whole, the agrarian policy was based in Russia on the fundamental idea that land does not belong to the peasant but is the ownership of the state or of the landlord. Miliukov and the liberals did not consider the commune a superior form of economic or social organization. "The liberals looked with small reverence upon the village commune itself, which they regarded merely as a survival which proved the backwardness of the economic conditions of their country."[49] During the great reforms of Alexander II the opinion prevailed that the commune had to make room for the more advanced form of land holding. The exception was the stand taken by Yuri Samarin, the renowned Slavophile. Miliukov remarked that on the basis of available statistics of the end of the last century the process of disintegration of the commune could be noted. Miliukov maintained that the agents which contributed to the making of the commune were partly absent and partly decreasing. The financial ties of the government were being relaxed and there were no more landlord authorities to direct the commune. In addition the individualistic tendency was increasing within the limits of the

---

[48]Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury, Vol. II, Part I, p. 210.

[49]Miliukov, "Russia", Athenaeum (July 1, 1893).

commune along with the material and moral development of its members.

In the analysis of the Russian historical process Miliukov found, that the Nationalistic idea, Autocracy and Orthodoxy which the Slavophiles considered inherent in the Russian character and immutable were neither peculiarly Russian nor unchangable. The Nationalistic idea, Autocracy and Orthodoxy, maintained Miliukov, underwent a process of constant change during the Russian historical evolution. Foreign influences were present, but these always worked along the lines of the inner process of development. He emphasized the impact of the German romanticists on the Russian Nationalistic idea; the influence of the Reformation upon the movement of Russian sectarianism and the presence of western European patterns in the political tradition of Russia. Miliukov found that the social structure was also a result of the historical evolution rather than that of some inherent traits of Russian character. Thus the basis for the commune was to be found not in the mystique idea of sobornost' (collectivity) of the Russian people but in the economic and political conditions of the country.

Miliukov, who hoped that in the future Russia will follow in her development the patterns of the western European states, maintained that the rapid economic growth of the country released the guardianship of the state and lod to the emancipation of the social orders and to their independence. He expressed his faith in the progress and change that was taking place in Russian life when he said that "...the present more and more tries to tear away

from the past and with it the legacy of history is losing its fatal power upon us..."[50] The task that lay before the Russian people was not the support of the archeological remains of the past, but the creation of a new cultural tradition, which would suit the contemporary social ideals, and this, said Miliukov, was actually happening. "...Das alte stürzt, es ändert sich die Zeit, und neues Leben blüht aus den Ruinen."[51] The ideal was for Miliukov liberalism, which contained a sweeping program of social and political reforms, the task of which was to transform the autocratic Russia into a modern progressive state.

---

[50] Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury, Vol. II, Part I, p. 210.

[51] Ibid. p. 222. The old (order) crumbles, the times are changing and new life emerges flourishing out of the ruins.

CHAPTER IV

MILIUKOV ON RUSSIAN LIBERALISM THROUGH 1906

> History may have its whims but it also has its laws; and if the law of Russia's history is progress....political reform may not be avoided.
>
> - P. N. Miliukov,"Russia and its Crisis"

Russian liberalism which appeared on the political scene as an active force at the turn of the century, was closely connected with the personality of P. N. Miliukov. In fact Miliukov represented the left wing of Russian liberalism, the ideology of which was embodied in the program of the Constitutional Democratic party founded in October 1905. Miliukov's liberalism was consistent with his outlook both as a historian and a political leader and distinguished itself by its uncompromising westernism and rationalism.

Liberalism is of Western European creation, the creation of the Graeco-Roman world of the Mediterranean. The basic idea of liberalism is the realization of the freedom of the individual. It is a belief in the value of the human personality and the conviction that the source of all progress lies in the free exercise of individual energy. In its later development liberalism in order to preserve its place as an advanced doctrine had to extend its meaning as to cover the new and enlarged scope of state

activity, and warranted a very active policy of social legislation. Miliukov, who looked to England as the country where liberalism found its fullest expression, emphasized the fact that this newer liberalism of Gladstone and Chamberlain was much unlike the "laissez-faire" liberalism of Cobden and Bright. He thought that in Russia the term liberalism was both extended and worn out. On one hand it connoted the idea of state intervention and was a progressive doctrine, on the other hand its meaning was limited to the idea of freedom and individual liberty, a thing which could no longer satisfy the people. But liberalism on the whole in Russia, Miliukov maintained, was not coloured with "laissez-faire" premises. "And since no developed Russian liberal thought had existed when "laissez-faire" ideas were popular in the West, it was free to become more democratic without being inconsistent with a former tradition."[1] The origins of Russian liberalism were unlike that of Western Europe. In the Western European states liberalism originated in the struggle of the wealthy and enlightened middle class of city inhabitants against the absolute power of the state and the landed aristocracy. In Russia liberalism in its first stage of development was directed against the landlord class, against the right to possess serfs, and was conducted by the members of the gentry and the nobility themselves. Motivated by philanthropic and ideological reasons, said Miliukov, they undermined their own status and represented in their actions not class but public opinion.

---

[1]P. N. Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1906), p. 224.

Miliukov's preoccupation with the western ideas of Comte and Mill explained the broadening of his ideas on liberalism so that in addition to the traditional liberal demands it included both social reforms and political democracy. Indeed he used the term "democratic liberalism" in order to distinguish it from the old traditional meaning. "Democratic liberalism of the newest type became the heir of the Westerners among the early intelligentsia just as populism came to replace the old ideas of the Slavophiles."[2] Opposed to the "archeological demophilism"[3] of the populists, he was nevertheless a great believer in democracy and affirmed the role of the masses and the belief in their progress when he said:

> ...How far will mankind travel on this path we do not know. But there is only one path by which the spontaneous historical process can be supplanted by the conscious: the gradual replacement of socially expedient acts of individuals by the socially expedient behaviour of the masses...[4]

Miliukov's views on the Russian type of liberalism based on his philosophy of history and the interpretation of the Russian historical process were expanded as early as the nineties.[5] Although preoccupied during this period with teaching and scholarly pursuits, he was keenly interested in the contemporary problems that troubled every member of the Russian intelligentsia. Defining the position of the liberals between the party of populists and the marxist groups, Miliukov went on to say that while the

---

[2]P. N. Miliukov, Iz istorii russkoi intelligentsii (St. Petersburg: 1903), p. 267.

[3]P. N. Miliukov, "Russia", Athenaeum (July 4, 1891).

[4]P. N. Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury (Jubilee edition, Paris, 1937), Vol. I, p. 18.

[5]P. N. Miliukov, "Russia", Athenaeum (London: 1889-1898).

populists put their hopes in the masses as the only source of salvation and were against all interference with them, the liberals maintained that in their present condition the peasantry was ignorant and calculated to act as a drag upon all social progress, and was in need of the guardianship of the intelligentsia. The liberals, he continued, sought political reforms as the step most immediately necessary. But the populists feared lest the triumph of the intelligentsia should entail that of bourgeoisie and preferred the retention of a democratic caesarism and asked for social reforms. On the other hand, the marxists, maintained Miliukov, in accordance with their theory that capitalism was an indispensible step on the road to collectivism, believed that political reforms were necessary in the interest of the future socialism. They also recognized the fact that the political reforms would lead to a transitory triumph of the middle classes. In relating the attitude of the liberals to the marxist group, Miliukov wrote that the liberals made concessions to this group. In their program they stressed the point that they were not so strictly individualistic as their name implied, and admitted partly the principle of collectivism and also that of state intervention. Although they insisted on the importance of commencing with political reforms, they were not opposed to the introduction of social reforms as well. George Fischer in his book Russian Liberalism calls the Miliukovite type of liberalism "the welfare liberalism of which Mill and Gladstone were the forerunners and Clemenceau and Lloyd George the early tribunes."[6] Just as they so Miliukov

---

[6]George Fischer, Russian Liberalism (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1958), p. 28

and also Petrunkevich[7] accepted the new creeds of democracy, a welfare state, and social and economic equity for the lower classes.

Social reforms were for Miliukov part and parcel of liberalism. Reviewing the events that preceded the revolution of 1905 before an American audience, Miliukov said that "now after social elements have come to the front it would be too late, would be impossible to separate political from social reforms."[8] The liberals acknowledgment of the necessity for social reforms was combined with the hope that this will bring them the cooperation of the revolutionary groups of the left, as well as the non-constitutionalist moderates of the right. Miliukov emphasized the fact that the liberal left (his liberalism) was uncompromisingly democratic in political philosophy, and that it was no use to talk of waiting till the Russian people were "ripe" for self-government. Centuries of autocratic absolutism had not ripened them, and only in a free state could they learn their responsibilities.[9]

Miliukov based his hopes for the fulfilment of liberalism in Russia on a priori premises. History was on the side of the liberals and, said Miliukov, "all that is attainable for others cannot be out of reach for us if we do not want to be considered the outcasts of humanity."[10] He maintained that the democratic

---

[7]Petrunkevich, a leader of the militant type of Russian liberalism at the turn of the century.

[8]P. N. Miliukov, "Constitutional Government for Russia", Civic Forum Addresses, Vol. I, No. 3, (January 14, 1908, New York).

[9]Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 522.

[10]P. N. Miliukov, God bor'by (St. Petersburg, 1907), p. 7.

order was bound to come because history was bringing it to Russia. "Whatever differences existed, Russia and the West still had in common what Bryce[11] called the laws of political biology, the general laws of political evolution under which at a certain point a representative system is inevitable."[12] The main idea was not that of "transfer" but of creation for oneself by every nation of similar political forms. This task of creation Miliukov considered to be that of the intelligentsia. Thus Miliukov based his hopes for the triumph of liberalism in Russia on his strong belief in the laws of history as well as on the previous development of liberal ideas in Russia's past.

In Russia the development of social classes ran a different course from that of western European states. The strong interference of the government in the building up of the estates was felt all through history. Liberalism in Russia found its support among the nobility and the gentry since they were the best educated classes of the Russian people. In its first stage liberalism was concerned with the freeing of the serfs; in the second stage it was a struggle for political liberty and social reforms. During the second half of the nineteenth century the ranks of the liberals were strengthened by the educated and more democratic elements of "mixed - ranks" (raznochintsy). "The program of the liberals," said Miliukov, "instead of becoming the representative opinion of landed and moneyed interest, followed the general trend of public

---

[11] James Bryce (1838-1922), British statesman, jurist and author.

[12] Miliukov, God bor'by, p. 26.

opinion, until by and by it became more democratic and radical."[13] In its second stage the history of Russian liberalism was in essence the history of a political party. Miliukov tried to push back the beginning of political parties in Russia to the year 1863, "as the year when continuous history of Russian political parties now in action (1903) began."[14]

During the reign of Catherine II, Miliukov asserted, public opinion made its appearance for the first time in Russia's history. Youth educated in the institutes of higher learning, independent of court service, formed its own circles where they expanded theories on the state, on education and on religion. They found the outlet for their ideas in journals and periodicals, professed democratism, stern morality, and wanted public initiative to take the place of bureaucracy. They were also affiliated with the masonic lodges which began their appearance in Russia. The outstanding representatives of these groups were Radishchev and Novikov. The first political program of Russian liberalism Miliukov found in the book of Radishchev, A Journey from Petersburg to Moscow. It contained a criticism of the bureaucratic regime and suggested the emancipation of the serfs, the abolition of the privileges of the nobility and liberty of the press and religious belief. It also contemplated a national representation and a constitutional government. The persecution of Radishchev and his friends constituted the first conflict between public opinion and the government. Miliukov found a breach in the continuity of

---

[13] Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 249.

[14] Ibid. p. 284.

liberalism in the period between Radishchev and Alexander I and blamed the lack of support of public opinion for Alexander's failure in promoting reforms. After the wars of Napoleon came the revival of liberalism which however was not a continuation of the liberalism of Radishchev. Generated in an independent source it was then christened by the European term "liberalism". It came as a result of closer contact with western European states. Many of the Russians who returned from abroad were greatly impressed by what they had seen in western Europe and began to organize societies fashioned after the German Tugendbund. They wanted the government to promote culture and public welfare. Miliukov considered this newly revived liberalism as less offensive than that of Radishchev.

With the advance of the revolutionary movement in Europe, the attitude of Russian liberals became more militant and demand for political reforms grew stronger. Two societies were formed. The Northern Society wanted a monarchical constitution, the Southern Society went further and demanded to see in Russia a federative republic after the American pattern. The Decembrist uprising organized by the societies ended in defeat and with it, Miliukov went on to say, "pure liberalism had lost its only chance of prevailing in Russia's public opinion."[15] The government of Nikolai I repressed the liberal ideas and failed to carry out peacefully a moderate political reform. In answer to the repressive measures of the government new political movements appeared in Russia.

---

[15]Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 260.

These were the populists and the revolutionary socialists. The liberals made common cause with the populists because the immediate object was the emancipation of the serfs. But after February 1861 the two parties separated. The populists thought of the masses as of the source of salvation, the liberals considered them ignorant and in need of education and guardianship. The opportunity to carry out their ideas with regard to the masses came to the liberals when Alexander II in the course of his reforms established the zemstvos (self-government). Miliukov considered the great reforms of Alexander II as essentially liberal, and thought "that the great reforms because of their liberalism proved to be neither durable nor consistently enough developed."[16] The reason for it was that the reforms fell victims to a disaffection of both the conservative and the radical groups. Though the "great reforms" came to an end, and the idea of political representation remained unrealized, the zemstvos became the nucleuses of liberal ideas that spread quickly among the gentry. The demands for political reforms were voiced at the different provincial assemblies of the zemstvos. The Tver assembly in 1862 asked for a national assembly and renunciation of class privileges. The Smolensk assembly demanded the abolition of the rights of the nobility. The Moscow meeting of the zemstvos of 1865 adopted the draft of a petition asking for a general representation of all the classes of the Russian people. At the same time Russian radicalism was becoming revolutionary. Its aim was a social revolution to be carried out by workers and peasants. The revolutionary parties thought that political reforms

---

[16]Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 264.

would profit the gentry and this stand weakened the power of the liberals on the point of political representation. Yet, said Miliukov, the demand for a constitution was heard from the radicals too, and Gertsen in 1862 asked for a constitutional assembly. Others disbelieved the possibility of success of such reforma and emphasized the unreadiness of the people for the new political order. The renowned novelist Turgenev wrote to Gertsen and Bakunin that the people were not as yet ready to decide for themselves what they needed: "...the role of the educated class in Russia is to transmit civilization to the people, in order that they themselves hereafter decide what they shall accept or repudiate...and this role is not yet played out..."[17]

Miliukov regretted the fact that in Russia social teachings prepossessed the more active spirits at the time when the work of political reforms was as yet not realized. He discerned in the political life of Russia in the second half of the nineteenth century three main groups. One was the conservative group formed by some moderate liberals with Aksakov as the leader of the nationalistic faction and Katkov as the head of the bureaucratic and centralistic wing. The second group was composed of revolutionary socialistic elements nourished by the theories of Bakunin and Gertsen that later however departed from these and went its own way. The liberals occupied a place between these two groups and had their headquarters in the zemstvos. They devoted their efforts to actual work among the people. The zemstvos lacked a foundation, because no boards existed below those of the districts

---

[17] Ibid. p. 280.

which could be charged with the execution of the decisions of the zemstvos. The roof was also lacking, the idea of "crowning the building" by a grant of a constitution did not materialize. Imperfect as they were the zemstvos stood in a striking contradiction to the existing order.[18] By a series of decretals the government came to curtail the work of the zemstvos, and many zemstvo men left discouraged by these measures. In view of the growing radicalism, Miliukov went on to say, the conscious members of the zemstvos in order to stop violence decided in 1878 to enter into negotiations with the revolutionary groups. Their proposals included the restitution of the original statutes of the zemstvo, abolition of the administrative evils and of special courts for political crimes, as well as a general representation elected by the zemstvos. They failed however in their attempt to reach an agreement and tried to petition the emperor asking for reform. Thus the assembly of Chernigov stated that destructive ideas cannot be overcome by repression. The assemblies of Tver and Kharkov expressed their hopes that the Tsar would "give the Russians what he already gave the Bulgarians."[19] It was then that the zemstvo people began to organize into a political party. First the society of Allied Zemstvos was established. In 1880 the liberals submitted a memorandum to Loris-Melikov, who was appointed by the government to fight the revolutionary groups and to win over the liberals for the government. The memorandum consisted of a long list of grievances, criticized bureaucracy and the lack of personal freedom. It ended by asking the government

---

[18] Ibid. p. 293. [19] Ibid. p. 304.

> ....to summon an independent assembly consisting of the representatives of the zemstvos, to give that assembly a share in the control of the national life, and securely to guarantee personal rights, freedom of thought and freedom of speech. The Russians are fit for free institutions, and they feel deep humiliation at being kept so long under guardianship..."[20]

Alas, said Miliukov, there was no agreement among the liberals as to what the much desired free institutions were to be. The conservatives wanted to go back to the old Slavophile idea and to revive the ancient Zemski Sobor which really was a deliberative assembly, summoned at irregular intervals, arbitrarily, composed, and discussed only these subjects, that the government wanted to be discussed. This scheme did not satisfy even the most moderate liberals, who advanced the idea of a share in the legislative power through the participation in the Council of State. The Allied Zemstvos thought of a four storied representative organization based on the idea of federalism on the American pattern. There were to be two chambers, one to represent the people, the other to represent the federal units. Another group asked the Tsar for the same institutions as he had already granted the Bulgarians. The Bulgarian constitution which, said Miliukov, was consistently democratic, included both of the features claimed by the democratic liberals of Russia, universal suffrage and one chamber. The most radical scheme demanded the "freedoms" and a convocation of a constituent assembly. With the death of Alexander II an attempt to introduce reforms was abandoned. In any case Loris-Melikov's program was far removed from the idea of

---

[20] Ibid. p. 308.

granting a constitution. Alexander III disregarded the demands of the liberals and reaffirmed his determination to preserve autocracy "which he found necessary and useful for Russia."[21] In 1881, continued Miliukov, appeared abroad the first liberal publication "The Free World" under the editorship of Professor Dragomanov. An attempt to find reconciliation with the liberals on the part of the government was made by Count Ignatev who approached the liberals on the basis of an old slavophile idea that the "power" must belong to the state and the "opinion" to the people. This meant that the Tsar would retain his autocratic power and the provinces would be granted self government. In addition there was a suggestion made of summoning from time to time of the "representatives of the provinces," appointed by the government on the pattern of the Zemski Sobor, which according to Miliukov, Ignatev intended to convene in May 1882. The liberals rejected the proposals. In the middle of the eighties Russian liberalism was inactive except for the press, and one of the best liberal papers was Vestnik Evropy (The Messenger of Europe).

Disappointed with the reactionary measures of the government and the inaction of the liberals, Miliukov found encouragement in the stand taken by the revolutionary socialistic groups. He saw the change in their attitude towards the idea of political reform. "...they began to understand the part of illusion in this very idea of a constitutional convention, and to see that the people were not ready to vote as they wished..."[22] Miliukov quotes to that effect an old revolutionary of the seventies, Stepniak,

---

[21] Ibid. p. 315. [22] Ibid. p. 320.

but qualifies the statement by saying "that this is not to be considered the generally accepted view of the Russian socialists for all time past and future."[23] He saw in this mood of the revolutionary groups a chance of reconciliation and cooperation which was missed by the government. The mood changed within a short period of time, and the immediate cause of the increased political activity was the famine of 1891. The new movement came from below and influenced Russian liberalism. In addition the accession to the throne of Nikolai II in 1895 brought new hopes to the liberals. The zemstvo members again approached the Tsar, and this time Miliukov went on to say, they were very moderate in their requests. They asked for preservation of law, for the right of the zemstva to petition the Tsar and for more freedom in treating questions of popular education. No hints however were contained in the petition with regard to the idea of limitation of the autocracy. Nikolai II answer warning the people against nurturing of "senseless dreams" provoked an open letter of the liberals who said inter alia: "...You challenged the zemstvos and with them Russian society, and nothing remains for them now but to choose between progress and faithfulness to autocracy.... You first began the struggle; and the struggle will come..."[24] The answer to the "senseless dreams" came in 1896; St. Petersburg saw the strike of 30,000 workers. In the year 1898 two parties were created, the Social Democratic party which preached political and revolutionary marxism and the Social Revolutionary party which was in its new form the revived party of People's Will, their program

---

[23] Ibid. p. 322. [24] Ibid. p. 328.

included agrarian revolution and terrorism. Thus within ten years, maintained Miliukov, the government came face to face with different political parties better organized and making a common front against the government. This was also true about the liberal circles, where Miliukov became the leader of the left wing Russian liberalism and he formulated its program, aims and tactics. It is of interest that Miliukov's idea of the fight against autocracy was that it should be carried out within the borders of legality.

By 1901 the liberals acquired the periodical "Osvobozhdenie" and Miliukov was offered the editorship of the paper which he however refused to accept, pointing out Struve as a possible candidate. One of the main reasons for his refusal was his hesitancy to leave the country from which he was absent for a number of years. By 1903 the liberals founded the Union of Liberation. The first and main aim of the Union of Liberation was the political freedom of Russia. In the realm of social-economic policy the Union of Liberation was to follow the same basic principle of democracy making the direct goal of its activity the defence of the interests of the laboring masses. The liberal moderates who did not enter the Union of Liberation were to be found in the Allied Zemstvo Constitutional group and in the "Beseda" (Debate) (1899), a group which wanted to continue the peaceful work of civilizing the masses. One of the members of this group was B. Maklakov, the future oponent of Miliukov. In 1902 Miliukov expanded his views on how the constitutional government in Russia was to be achieved. The first step was the

acquisition of personal and political freedoms followed by an assembly composed of representatives named by the zemstvos. The task of the assembly was to draft an electoral law in order to bring an organization of national parliament chosen by a popular election. Miliukov concluded the article by emphasizing that this kind of political reform is as applicable to Russia as it is to any other country:

> ...free forms of political life are no more national than are the use of an alphabet or a printing press, or steam or electricity. They are simply forms of advanced culture sufficiently broad and flexible to contain within them heterogeneous national content.[25]

In 1903 Miliukov[26] further developed the program and laid forward the tactics of the future party. He thought that this was necessary because "Liberation" was serving too large a circle of people and political currents. He maintained that disagreements have already arisen. The party was to be constitutionalist and democratic, and there was no room for the Slavophiles in its midst. Into the ranks of the party were to be admitted only convinced constitutionalists. The main idea was the replacement of autocracy by a constitutional government. The democratic character of the party demanded the clarification of the social problems, the agrarian and labor. This point was stressed strongly. "The liberal democratic party", said Miliukov, "has to give a wide and orderly program of reforms leaving aside the problem of socialism,

---

[25] P. N. Miliukov, "Chto takoe "konstitutsiia" Loris Melikova?," Osvobozhdenie, No.11 (November 18, 1902).

[26] P. N. Miliukov, "K ocherednym voprosam" Osvobozhdenie, No. 17, (February 16, 1903).

first and foremost because socialism still remains within the realms of problematic questions."[27] He admitted that such a party cannot represent Russian liberalism of all shades, because the shades are to various, and because "everybody in Russia is a liberal at a moment like the present."[28] But the party will form the left wing of Russian liberalism.

In accordance with the slogan "no enemies on the left," Miliukov laid great hopes on the cooperation of the socialist and revolutionary parties. Agreement between the parties became possible because "the revolutionists became more practical and the liberals more democratic and more advanced in their demands."[29] Thus in 1904 a conference in Paris took place with Miliukov as one of the delegates. In the conference participated five revolutionary and three oppositional organizations. They agreed on a general declaration condemning autocracy and asking for a democratic regime based on universal suffrage. Included was also the idea of freedom of development for the nationalities. The declaration ended with a call for united action to achieve the fall of absolutism. Miliukov, speaking of the agreement, did not overlook the ambiguities that were contained in it. "A democratic regime," he said, "is understood by the moderate parties as a constitutional monarchy, while a republic is the only regime consistent with the socialistic claims."[30] He hoped however, that as a step towards the realization of their own program, the revolutionary parties would be more ready to admit a constitutional monarchy

---

[27] Ibid. [28] Ibid.

[29] Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 523. [30] Ibid. p.526.

than to accept even temporarily a constitutional formula. The agreement did not mention economic reforms. Miliukov asserted that the reason for the omission was not that the Russian liberals opposed economic reforms, for they stated it clearly in their program that their aim is the defense of the interests of the working masses. But he added "this formula was at variance with that of the socialists who preached the defense of the interests of the proletariats by the proletariats."[31] Although he wanted to see the cooperation of the left with the liberals, it seems that he was all the time aware of the obstacles that lay in the way.

> Harmonization is hardly possible between a program that tries to sharpen, and one that tries 'to blunt' the social contradictions. One works for 'social peace' while the other aims at 'social revolution'; one is rather humanitarian, while the other is strictly a 'class doctrine'; one is opportunistic and works through compromise, while the other is uncompromising and works through social struggle.[32]

And yet he profoundly hoped for their cooperation in the fight for political reforms.

The Russo - Japanese war intensified in Russia the oppositional movement. Miliukov on the pages of "Liberation" expressed his views on the situation in a polemic with Struve. He, like many others, believed in the slogan "chem khuzhe tem luchshe" (the worse the better) having in mind the idea that the weakening of autocracy will bring the political reforms closer to reality. He maintained that "the public opinion is against the war, and against the victory of Russia over Japan."[33] Russian military defeats turned public opinion more and more against the government. In

---

[31] Ibid. p. 527. [32] Ibid. p. 527.

[33] P. N. Miliukov, "Voina i russkaia oppozitsiia" Osvobozhdenie, No. 45, April 4, 1904.

July 1904 the minister of interior, Pleve, was assassinated and in September Tsar Nikolai appointed as successor the liberal-minded Prince P. D. Sviatopolk-Mirski. While certain circles looked renewed hope for a "new course" of action on the part of the government. Miliukov warned against the false hopes and stressed again that the "new course" had nothing in common with the demands for people's representation and for a constitution similar to that given to Bulgaria with universal suffrage and one chamber. Miliukov told Prince Mirski that "his appeal for confidence was useless, that between autocracy and consistent constitutionalism there is no intermediate position", and significantly he added: "We shall not give you not one of our men until you will accept our program in its entirety, because even then we do not know, whether we will succeed in saving Russia from your political dilettantism, and without a strong shock put her on the way to peaceful political development."[34] When Mirski first sanctioned and then forbade the Zemstvo Congress of November 1904, the event was triumphantly cited by Miliukov as a proof of the "fiasco" of the new policy.[35]

The first congress of the Union of Liberation took place in Petersburg in 1904. At the congress Miliukov expressed his opinion that the liberals should demand a legislative national assembly elected directly by the people. By November the same year, the Union organized a zemstvo congress and a series of

---

[34] P. N. Miliukov, "Novyi kurs", Osvobozhdenie, No. 57, (October 2, 1904).

[35] P. N. Miliukov, "Fiasko 'novogo kursa'," Osvobozhdenie, No. 60, (November 10, 1904).

national banquets. The Union by that time had a program, a nationwide organizational network and was far better organized than other revolutionary parties. The second congress of the Union of Liberation in October 1904 was followed a month later by the congress of Allied Zemstvo-Constitutionalists. Although the members of the Zemstvo-Constitutionalists were not identical with the members of the Union of Liberation, their program, Miliukov was happy to stress, was that of the Union of Liberation. He was greatly impressed by the congress of the Allied Zemstvo-Constitutionalists of 1904. This was the first meeting, he thought, which represented all the zemstvos and summarized the opinion of the zemstvos not only on local questions but on general and political questions as well. The petition of this congress, he called after the English pattern, "Petition of Rights" and said that it "will remain a beautiful page in our annals; and whatever be its immediate practical consequences, its political importance cannot be overestimated."[36] The petition asked for all the fundamental rights of the individual and the citizen, a large measure of local and municipal self-government, and a regular representation in a separate elective body, which must participate in legislation, in working out budget, and in controlling the administration. In the last paragraph of their petition the members of the Zemstvos asked that the reforms be carried out with the assistance of the freely elected representatives of the people, which implied the convocation of a constituent assembly. Miliukov called the petition

---

[36] P. N. Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 530. See also P. N. Miliukov, Constitutional Government for Russia, Civic Forum Addresses, Vol. I, No. 3, (January 14, 1908, New York).

"the first political program of the Russian liberal party"[37] openly proclaimed in an assembly which had full moral right to represent liberalism throughout the empire. He further stressed the fact that this program was widely endorsed by all social groups and though the socialistic publications tried to draw a line of distinction between the demands of the liberals and their own, in many cases the demands were agreed to since they did not contradict, and often were implied in the demands of the liberals. "No more united and "co-ordinated" political action has ever been witnessed in the history of the country."[38]

Thus during the prologue to the revolution of 1905 Russian liberalism succeeded in spreading their demands among the wide stratas of population. The answer of the Tsar to the petition, as given by Pobedonostsev, was that "Russia would fall into sin and return to a state of barbarism if the Tsar should renounce his power."[39] Miliukov called the policy of the government, which was concerned with the "freezing out" of everything that was alive, "government nihilism". The imperial manifestos of March 11, 1903, or December 25, 1904, only contributed to the mood of scepticism among the wide circles of the people, nobody relied any more on the sincerity of the promises given by the government. Miliukov thought that since the liberal current was gradually radicalized and democratized, and "the utopian element was vanishing from the socialistic programs, the way was paved for the transformation of the revolutionary into a political party and of its methods of its methods of struggle from oriental to European."[40] In a reply

---

[38] Ibid. p. 531. [39] Ibid. p. 532. [40] Ibid. p. 561.

to Professor Kuz'min Karavaev, he declared "now not one leftist party believes in an immediate social overturn since in a rapid reform all the parties see the broadening of the possible means of action; one thing the liberals must not do, treat allies like enemies."[41] By the decision of the Union of Liberation, professional unions (soiuzy) were organized, and in May 1905 Miliukov was chosen chairman of the soiuz soiuzov (Union of Unions), the central organization of the various unions. He considered this kind of organization a necessary expedient caused by the political situation in Russia. Since the Russian intelligentsia were not permitted to organize into parties, it turned to the soiuz (union). He regarded them temporary and accidental organizations caused by the abnormal political life of the country.

During the year 1905, the Liberationists and the Allied Zemstvo-Constitutionalists devoted much of their attention to organize support among public bodies, the zemstvo and municipal congresses, and the "professional unions" (soiuzy). The Union of Unions proved in its attitude even more radical than Miliukov, when it voted against the participation in the Bulygin[42] Duma and declared in its July 1905 conference, that terrorism was justified by the conduct of the government. The behaviour of the government radicalized the circles of the Zemstvo Constitutionalists and this mood was expressed during the forthcoming third and fourth Zemstvo congresses. Meanwhile the military defeats brought the first concession from the government, the law of August 6, 1905. The

---

[41]Miliukov, God bor'by, p. 33.

[42]Bulygin, Minister of Interior, who came to replace the liberal-minded Sviatopolk-Mirski.

Tsar agreed to call a duma. The Duma, which was to have very limited powers, was boycotted by the revolutionary parties and the Union of Unions, but Miliukov, to the surprise of many, declared for the participation in the Duma. He said that although the attitude of the public opinion towards the law of August 6 was negative, this attitude did not exclude the necessity "to use the law in order to fight against it."[43] Moreover, he saw in the proclamation of August 6, 1905, the sign that autocracy was giving way to the progressive ideas, and thought that the political significance of this law was great. Many times during her past history, wrote Miliukov, Russia advanced towards a more democratic form of government but did not reach the goal. He agreed that "between what the Duma gives society and what society wants is a great abyss," nevertheless he continued, "the act of August 6 is not simply a piece of paper; from it can be no turning back."[44] In answer to the Slavophiles, Miliukov undertook to trace the development of the idea of the duma in the past and tried to show how the western influences, which the Slavophiles denied, were present in the project of Bulygin.[45] Miliukov showed the evolutionary development of the idea from Count Valuev's project of 1863, Melikov's of the 1880 to Speranskii's of the beginning of the nineteenth century. The latter seemed to have been strongly influenced by the French constitution. Thus, said Miliukov, "we did not depart from the western forms, only from the contemporary and more progressive forms, and maybe we did not arrive at these forms

---

[43] P. N. Miliukov, Rossia organizuetsia", Osvobozhdenie, No. 74 (July 13, 1905).

[44] Miliukov, God bor'by, p. 201. [45] Ibid. p. 56-59.

yet."[46]

The events moved fast in the year 1905. The Zemstvists came closer to the ideas of Allied Zemstvo Constitutionalists. It was decided to form a party together with the Liberationists. By October the party of the Kadets, Constituional Democrats, was organized and in the inaugurating speech Miliukov, with great enthusiasm and self-assurance, outlined the aim and the program of the party.[47] It was the first open political party in Russia, which already had an established tradition. The party was composed, said Miliukov, of two groups, one that belonged to the Union of Liberation and the other that emerged from the Allied Zemstvo Constitutionalists. In its attitude to the "right" the party did not deny the unity of Russia and the inviolability of private property but was opposed to the autocratic centralization of the ministry, and Miliukov further declared, that the Kadets will never stand in awe of the interests of the gentry and industrialists to the damage of the interests of the working classes. In defining the position of the party to the groups of the "left," Miliukov emphasized that the Kadets will not join them in their demands for a republic, and for the socialization of the means of production. Some did not share these ideas, because they considered them unacceptable in general, others, Miliukov maintained, considered them as lying outside the realm of practical politics. Miliukov described the Kadets as closely approaching the group known in the West as social reformers, although their program was

---

[46] Ibid. [47] Ibid. p. 97.

further left than any other analogous party in the West. Russia was, according to the program of the party, to emerge as a constitutional state after the pattern of the Western constitutional states. And according to Miliukov's philosophy of history, as well as his conception of Russian history, Russia did not have to go through all the stages the Western European states had passed through, since in her own way she already went through these. The party was essentially parliamentary by nature, and was to enter the Duma with "the exclusive aim of fighting for political freedom and just representation."[48] The party wanted to see in Russia a parliamentary rule under a constitutional monarch. As to the agrarian problem, the Kadets proposed a systematic extension of the emancipation reform of 1861, by dealing out additional allotments to the communes from the free (crown) lands, and from the larger private estates, which were to be expropriated by means of a compulsory sale at a fair price.[49] Although strongly opposed to violence, the Kadets, who were fighting for the ideals of freedom, equality, sovereignty of the people's will, and social justice for the working class, could not in the last resort reject "revolution". In their struggle against autocracy they were ready to accept the revolution as a means, never as an end in itself. Shortly after the first Congress of the Kadet Party, Miliukov wrote: "We will understand and fully recognize the supreme law of revolution as a factor creating the law of the future in open struggle with the historical law of the already outmoded political order." But he

---

[48] Ibid. p. 101.

[49] Miliukov, Constitutional Government for Russia, Civic Forum Addresses.

went on to say, the Kadets did not make of it a fetish and regarded it as a means of struggle good if it were to obtain the desired objective and bad if it was to harm it. He further continued:

> ...Yes we are for the people - but we reject the pretensions of those who wish alone to speak in the name of the people and limit their conception of the people to the book concept of 'conscious proletariat'. Yes we are for revolution.... but against these who declare the revolution to be 'permanent', unleashing its elemental forces, giving it unattainable ends."[50]

Miliukov went on to say to the "leftist" parties that by delaring the revolution permanent they isolate themselves from the Kadets with whom they have common aims. He based his efforts to win the cooperation of the leftist parties on the a priori conception, that according to the laws of dialectical materialism a bourgeois revolution had to precede a socialist one. "We accept the politi-jargon of our opponents and remind them that the political victory of the bourgeoisie, by their own teaching, is all that can be achieved in the present moment."[51] He hoped that "there would be no need for a socialist revolution, that actual practice of universal suffrage will do more than anything else to wean the socialists from utopianism"[52] and he had evidence for it in the West European socialism.

Shortly after the establishment of the Constitutional Democratic Party the October Manifesto was published. It was received with great enthusiasm by various strata of public opinion. Miliukov agreed that the Manifesto contained in principle acknowledgment of the justice of the demands for which generations were struggling

---

[50]Miliukov, God bor'by, p. 165. [51]Ibid. p. 366.
[52]Miliukov, Russia and its Crisis, p. 522.

in vain. He thought however that it came a little late and in "its contents it did not represent even the minimum of concessions necessary at the present moment."[53] When asked by the members of his party to comment on the Manifesto, he poured some cold water on the general enthusiasm of the assembled by saying that nothing has changed, that the struggle goes on. Miliukov and his party resolved to go to the Bulygin Duma with the aim to fight for political freedom and just representation, and they were ready to go to the new Duma with the same spirit. As a representative institution, the Witte Duma was regarded as little better than the Duma of Bulygin. But the Kadets hoped to obtain a large delegation in the assembly, that was to be called on the basis of the electoral law of December 11, 1905. The Kadets wanted to make the Duma into an opposition body and began a feverish work among the middle classes, the students, and to some extent in the villages. They made use of their gifted journalists and press. From February 1906 the chief party organ "Rech" (Speech) began to appear. Miliukov wrote in almost all of the party papers, and expressed the views of the party on the problems of the day.

The second Congress of the Kadet party met in January 1906 among the tremors of revolution and counter-revolution. The Congress changed the Kadet program and demanded a constitutional and parliamentary monarchy which it seems Miliukov had always considered as the only possible solution for Russia.[54] It declared against armed uprising and called for unity among the opposition

---

[53] Miliukov, God bor'by, p. 77.

[54] Miliukov, Constitutional Government for Russia, Civic Forum Addresses.

parties. In spite of the movement to the right, Miliukov asserted that the Kadet party remained "an opposition party ready to call to account the enemies of democratic constitutionalism and social reforms. Opponents of the Kadet party," said Miliukov, "seek in vain...for any kind of evidence of treachery or change of position."[55] In spite of disagreement on the point of armed uprising, Miliukov remained faithful to his idea of cooperation with the left, and hoped for their cooperation in the Duma. The left nevertheless decided to boycott the Duma. Miliukov with bitterness wrote in "Speech" - "let the Kadet aim be represented by the striving toward the political victory of the 'bourgeoisie', let their limitation to proximate task be called the classic treachery of the bourgeoisie, let the struggle against revolutionary Blanquism be called the organization of counter-revolution." But, he continued with confidence, "we know very well that the bourgeoisie constitutes 90% of the population and that 'treachery' and 'betrayal' is the terminology of utopians that do not accept the 'laws of history'." The extreme left, Miliukov went on to say, denied the parliamentary means of struggle and while protesting against "parliamentary illusions" they clung to "archaic revolutionary illusions" believing that they will organize such a revolution by Blanquism, and conspiracy, a tactic long repudiated even by the theoreticians of the left parties themselves.[56] The struggle "one to one" between the revolutionaries and the government, continued Miliukov, was hopeless if its aim was the immediate victory of the revolution.

---

[55] Miliukov, God bor'by, p. 116.

[56] Ibid. p. 348-349.

But this struggle was inevitable if there were no other means available. In this case there was a better alternative, the Duma. Although Miliukov called for parliamentary forms of struggle on the part of the revolutionary parties, he admitted, that the Kadets themselves were not yet sure whether these forms were most suitable for the Russian reality. Yet the opposition had to do its best with the means that existed. Miliukov blamed the ambiguity of the Kadets' position on the"situation itself" reflecting all the contradictions of a moment of transition.[57]

The socialist parties boycotted the elections. The Kadets remained alone among the parties of the opposition in the field. The vigorous campaign in the spring of 1906 proved very successful, and resulted in the impressive majority of the party. The third party Congress met a week before the opening of the Duma to work out its legislative tactics and its program. Miliukov with confidence and enthusiasm asserted "that now we are strong, the victory is in our hands, we have achieved the aim of our striving."[58] He based the activity of the party in the forthcoming Duma on four theses. These were: to secure by legislative measures the "freedoms"; habeas corpus and political equality, to introduce the Four Tail electoral system (the elections were to be universal, equal, direct and secret), in the national representation as well as in the local self-government to solve the agrarian problem by legislation and to satisfy the just demands of the nationalities.[59] In the first Duma the Kadets had 153 delegates out of the total number of 449. Miliukov was not a member of the Duma, but his was

---

[57] Ibid. p. 349. [58] Ibid. p. 332. [59] Ibid. p. 334.

the work done behind the scenes. He even counted on a possibility of organizing a Kadet ministry with the support of the Trudoviks (the Group of Toil) and other small factions. The Duma began its sessions on April 27, 1906, and was dissolved on July 8 of the same year. The Duma actually passed one law (money for famine relief). Another law, that of abolishing capital punishment though passed by the Duma, was not signed by the Tsar. Nonetheless several laws were under the consideration of the Duma at the time of its dismissal. These were the laws of securing the freedoms, reforming the judiciary, guaranteeing equality of classes, and inquiry into the Belostok pogrom, and the law for land reform. The Kadets' land reform was introduced into the Duma as project 42. It was based on the principle of expropriation with compensation. During the third Congress of the party when the theses for the future work of the party in the Duma were drafted, there had been demands to go further in the idea of the agrarian reform and to proclaim the nationalization of all the land, although this was not to affect the peasant holdings immediately. Miliukov, who was against nationalization, explained that the slogan "nationalization had no uniform meaning."[60] In the West notably in England and the United States the purpose of nationalization was to take land from the control of speculation or aristocratic land holdings and to distribute it among the smallholder. In these countries it constituted a progressive measure. In Russia, on the other hand, not only did the idea of private property develop very slowly, especially in certain parts of Russia, but nationalization

---

[60] Ibid. p. 339.

was an old Moscovite principle in which traces of Moslem and Byzantine influences could be found. Miliukov thought that the idea of nationalization of the land did not look too attractive for Russia and maintained that recent researches made by specialists did not indicate the immediate ruin of the smallholder and the old marxist scheme was far removed from reality. His opinion was that the peasantry would not approve of the scheme when they will find "nationalization" meaning the interference not only with the land of the gentry but their own as well. The Kadets wanted to leave the peasant holdings untouched but wanted the apportionment to the needy smallholder of the lands which were to be expropriated from the gentry, the state and the church lands. The Kadets' appeal to the country to support the Duma's land law was used as a pretext for the dissolution of the Duma by the Tsar on July 8, 1906. There were attempts made during the session to form a non-bureaucratic ministry. Shipov was offered a post under Witte and later Miliukov was asked to join a coalition ministry of the Kadets and the government party, which he refused. He was ready to accept a ministry based on a Duma majority. In an interview with Witte, that took place shortly before the dismissal of the Duma, Miliukov advised him to adopt a constitution on the pattern of the Bulgarian or Belgian constitutions.

The dismissal of the Duma was a defeat of the Kadet party and of its leader. Writing in "Speech" Miliukov asserted with bitterness that "as a matter of fact there is in the event nothing new. The Russian reality only confirms itself, it confirms that in it rules not the law of reason and advisability, but the law

of the unforeseen and the unexpected."[61] The Vyborg Manifesto drafted under the leadership of Miliukov though not signed by him, ended the first stage of the parliamentary struggle on which Miliukov laid all his hopes in spite of the adverse conditions prevalent in the country.

Miliukov's liberalism had its basis in his philosophy of history and his interpretation of the Russian historical revolution. He rejected the idea of a special mission of the Russian people and the special path it had to follow. Since the influence of the environment and of the historical conditions was pointing in the direction of Western European development in the social and economic life of Russia, political reforms were inevitable. Russia, maintained Miliukov, had had a long liberal tradition which dated back to the end of the eighteenth century. He considered the socialistic revolutionary ideas as utopian and sought the cooperation of the parties of the left in achieving the goals of overthrowing the autocratic regime and establishing of a constitutional monarchy. England was, for Miliukov, the ideal of social and political structure and it was to England that he looked for guidance. In comparing Russian liberalism with that of Germany, Miliukov maintained that in Russia it had a much greater chance to succeed since the transition in Germany from a medieval estate monarchy into a parliamentary state was much slower than that of Russia from a democratic patriarchial autocracy. In the former this transition had to take decades while in the latter it could be achieved immediately.

---

[61] Ibid. p. 523.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION: MILIUKOV AND THE DEBATE BETWEEN THE SLAVOPHILES AND THE WESTERNERS

> ...We are assisted by the extraordinary receptivity and giftedness of the Russian character, the instinctive feeling of our national might, the consciousness of being a great people with a world mission...
>
> - Ivan Aksakov

> Russia does not differ essentially from Europe; but Russia is not yet essentially one with Europe.
>
> - Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

Many historians and philosophers have since contested the thesis of Miliukov, and have expounded their own interpretations of the Russian character and Russian historical evolution. An attempt will be made to consider briefly some of these interpretations. It seems that the essence of the old controversy between the Slavophiles and the Westerners, that began over a hundred years ago, still persists though in a different form in our own day.

Miliukov's theory was that "Russia is Europe" and that in her development she can and has to follow the pattern of the European states. There was nothing unique in the Russian national character, asserted Miliukov, that would prevent her from acquiring similar political and social organization. The only difference between Russia and Europe lay in certain peculiarities of her historical evolution that were quickly disappearing.Believing firmly

in the laws of scientific sociology, Miliukov was confident in the ultimate victory in Russia of the western over oriental patterns.

Professor Nikolas Berdiaev contended that the Russians are neither Europeans nor Asiatic, but something of both and unique. He maintained that two contradictory principles lay at the foundation of the structure of the Russian soul. These are a natural dionysian, elemental paganism, and ascetic monastic orthodoxy. He saw in the Russians a predilection for dogmatism as against scepticism, for total world outlooks and masimalism as against relativism. He further contended that Russians have a tendency to embrace the eschatological, to be concerned with the doctrine of the last or final things; a hatred of authority and yet a willingness to submit to it. Berdiaev refuted the ideas of the populists on the economic superiority of the Russian commune (mir). He admitted that "the sense of community does actually belong to the Russian people in a greater degree than to the peoples of the West,"[1] because they have less of the western individualism. But this he explained in terms of metaphysical property of the Russian people, which is not tied with any form of economic life whatever. The idea of spiritual community, of 'sobornost', said Berdiaev, is inherent in Orthodoxy and is essentially a Russian idea with its belief that truth resides in the collectivity of the Church. Socialism, continued Berdiaev, is deeply rooted in the Russian nature. He thought that the expression of it was to be found in the fact that the Russian

---

[1]N. A. Berdiaev (N. A. Berdyaev), The Russian Idea (London: Geoffrey Bles. The Centenary Press, 1947), p. 50.

people did not recognize the Roman conception of property. A primary fact about Russian socialism was the decisive predominence in it of the social over the political elements. Berdiaev quotes the letter that Gertsen wrote to Michelet on the future development of Russia: "...Russia will never make a revolution with the purpose of getting rid of the Tsar Nikolai and replacing him by representative tsars, judge-tsars, policemen-tsars..."[2] Gertsen, continued Berdiaev, wanted to express the idea, that there will be in Russia no bourgeois, no liberal revolution, but a social revolution only. The revolution had to begin with Russia because only there the Christian outlook upon the world was held with strength and purity.

Writing past the events of 1917, Berdiaev asserted that a liberal bourgeois revolution was in Russia an utopia which did not correspond either with Russian traditions or with the revolutionary ideas which provailed in Russia. In Russia the revolution could be only socialistic, and totalitarian, because "all Russian ideology has always been totalitarian, theocratic or socialistic."[3]

G. P. Fedotov,[4] in his study of the religious mind in the period from the tenth to the thirteenth century emphasizes the traits of Russian character that were already expounded by Berdiaev. Thus he speaks of the messianic ideas present in the early Russian chronicles and of the eschatological interest of the Russian people. He also stresses the ethical in the early Russian religious

---

[2]Ibid. p. 105. [3]Ibid. p. 249.

[4]G. P. Fedotov, The Russian Religious Mind (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1946); See also John S. Reshatar, Jr., "Problems of Analyzing and Predicting Soviet Behaviour", Doubleday Short Studies in Political Science. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Inc., 1955), p. 19-23.

literature and finds there the element of love and charity strongly emphasized. Fedotov maintains that the Russian inability to appreciate law for its own value as an ethical minimum, had its roots in early Christian tradition of Russia. The Russian, said Fedotov, was always above the law or below it. This was fatal to the Russian civic development.

In the political evolution of Russia Fedotov stressed upon the conflict and distinction between Muscovite Russia and the Russia of Peter. He saw Muscovy as having been influenced by more than two centuries of Tatar domination, and it was this influence that left an imprint upon the Russian historical tradition and the Russian type. And it was Muscovy Russia, maintained Fedotov, that won over the Petrine Russia with its European orientation. He saw the triumph of the Muscovite type in the Soviet state, with its emphasis upon the obedience, its weak individual consciousness and its worship of collectivity. Thus Fedotov saw in addition to the influence of the Orthodox Christianity the impact of the historical evolution upon the formation of the Russian character.

In a recent study of Russian liberalism V. Leontowitsch[5] gives his interpretation of the development of liberalism in Russia and of the reasons for its defeat. He maintains that the roots of liberalism were lacking in Russia. These, according to his opinion, were feudalism and the independence of the spiritual from the temporal power in the course of the Middle Ages. In his further analysis, Leontowitsch quotes the Russian philoscpher and statesman Chicherin, who maintained that the fatal occurence for

---

[5]V. Leontowitsch, Geschichte des Liberalismus in Russland (1762-1917) (Frankfurt, 1957).

Russian liberalism was its sudden turn to radicalism during the reign of Alexander I. This phenomenon Chicherin considered ominous for the future of Russian liberalism. The Decembrists, and before them the secret societies, released the fatal pendulum between reaction and revolution, and since then the path of Russian liberalism between these elemental forces became narrow. Leontowitsch also agrees with Chicherin that the main factor of the failure of liberalism in Russia lay in the mentality of the Russian people. This mentality that was formed under the krepostnoi regime (The regime of serfdom) continued to persist. Chicherin when describing the mood prevalent among the Russian people during the first years of the rule of Alexander II said: "...the people did not know what to do with the relative freedom which they should have started to enjoy...There are liberals that long for an iron press, there are people that feel lost because they are not led in leading strings any more..."[6] Thus the main obstacle for the development of liberalism in Russia constituted not the remains of the factual conditions of serfdom, but the imprint that it left on the mentality of the Russian people. This mentality remained insensitive towards the nature and the limits of genuine freedom and killed in the people the ability for self-restraint.

> ...Russia is of our kind, exhibits our own quality, is what Europe has been...Russia is Europe as well. When, therefore, I contrast Russia and Europe, I contrast two epochs. Russia does not differ essentially from Europe; but Russia is not yet essentially one with Europe.[7]

These were Thomas Masaryk's views on Russia and the Russians and

---

[6]Ibid. p. 141.

[7]T. G. Masaryk, The Spirit of Russia (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1919), Vol. I, p. 6.

seem to be of special interest since they were expounded before the Russian revolution of 1917. He maintained that Russia was essentially Europe but not quite yet Europe, the contrast between Russia and Europe being no more absolute than between present and past. Of course, said Masaryk, there are differences between the Russians and other nations of Western Europe, but at the same time there are differences between the Italians and the French and the English too. Masaryk rejected the idea of "explanation of the historical evolution as determined by nationality and race, as the outcome of national character."[8] He did not accept the doctrines of historic materialism; neither did he admit that the influence of the natural environment suffices to explain history, least of all Russian history, where in view of the size of the country and conglomeration of nationalities great differences exist. For him man is the essence of mankind and he believes that in "the extant natural and social conditions man forms himself."[9]

Masaryk disagreed with Gertsen and the other Russian thinkers who maintained that liberalism was alien to Russia, and gave a detailed account of the history of Russian liberalism in his book The Spirit of Russia. He emphasized the fact that Russian liberalism, as it appeared in 1905, was more democratized and greater stress was put upon the social problems in the Russian liberalism than in the West European type of liberalism. He thought that the reason for the revolutionary and anarchistic tendencies of the Russians lay in the impact that the European thought had upon them. While in Europe the ideas of Voltaire, Hume, Kant,

---

[8] Ibid. Vol. II, p. 556. [9] Ibid. Vol. II, p. 557.

Comte, Hegel and Feuerbach were organic links in the evolutionary chain, the introduction of these ideas into Russia signified a profound spiritual revolution. Orthodox Russia in a state of spiritual arrest, representing the intellectual traits of the third century, said Masaryk, was overwhelmed by the French anti-religious rationalism, later was captivated by the German philosophers notably Hegel and Feuerbach and the positivists Comte and Mill. The result of the sudden illumination was the revolution - a mental and political revolution against the dominant theocracy. He considered the mood of pessimism, nihilism as "a natural consequence of this unabridged transition from orthodoxy to atheism, materialism and positivism."[10] Although he admitted the impact of Russian Orthodoxy on the Russians, he did not regard it or autocracy as being peculiarly Russian institutions.

Masaryk accepted the idea of the great influence of Europe upon Russia, at the same time, he maintained, Russia also underwent a development no less independent than that of the various western nations. Parallel evolutionary development can be discovered in the case of Russia and of Europe in respect of feudalism, capitalism, constitutionalism, the revolution and of many other phenomena. Masaryk, in conclusion, maintained that the Russians are forgetting that their goal is not revolution but democracy and defined the drift of the Russian thought in the first decade of the twentieth century by saying that "Russian Orthodoxy is being replaced by German Protestantism. By the term Orthodoxy and Protestantism were to be understood not merely theology, but the whole ecclesiastical

---

[10] Ibid. p. 483.

culture, leadership and organization of the respective societies."[11] Masaryk, a great democrat, wanted to see democracy triumphant in the future order of mankind including Russia.

Although these interpretations consider the problem of Russia's historical evolution from different philosophical points of view, none seem to be in agreement with Miliukov's interpretation of Russia's historical process and his conclusions therefrom. The neo-Slavophiles believed in the inherent and unique traits of the Russian character, which was to decide in the future, as in the past, the form of the political and social organization of the country, as well as Russia's position among the nations of the world. In this respect their point of view is wholly irreconcilable with the ideas of Miliukov. For them nothing has changed since Chaadaev made his famous statement that "...the Russians belong to the number of those nations which do not enter into the structure of mankind, but exist only in order to teach the world an important lesson of some sort."[12] Miliukov himself seemed to have admitted by implication the victory of the Slavophile over the Westerners' ideology when he said that the Soviet state has in essence overtaken the old Slavophile idea of messianism, the idea that the Russians had a message to bring to the world.[13] Whether Soviet Russia did in reality take over some features of the Slavophile ideology is a matter of opinion, but Miliukov's admission of his own failure seems quite obvious.

---

[12]Berdyaev, The Russian Idea, p. 36.

[13]P. N. Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury, (Jubilee edition, Paris, 1937), Vol. I, p. 3.

The ideas of T. Masaryk resemble in one respect the views of Miliukov in that he too does not see any specific inherent features in the Russian character. He refuses to agree with Miliukov that Russia has reached in her development the stage which would enable her to acquire a system of social and political organization similar to that of the western European states. What was for Miliukov self-understood, because of his belief in the laws of history, was for Masaryk a hope only. He hoped for the victory of democracy in Russia, which was to come there, as it was to come to other countries in the future. George Fischer, who unlike Masaryk wrote his book post factum of the events discussed, explained the failure of Miliukov's liberalism (the liberalism of the Kadets) in terms of the dilemma that was not specifically Russian, "the dilemma of attaining complex, specifically Western objectives in an illiberal, underdeveloped society."[14] He termed the Russian type of liberalism "have-not"[15] liberalism which develops in a society underdeveloped economically, culturally and psychologically.

In order to evaluate Miliukov's views on liberalism in Russia one has, it seems, to turn to his philosophy of history. He was first and foremost an historian, and as he himself admitted "the historian had influenced the political leader."[16] He was a positivist with a strong faith in the laws of history that

---

[14] G. Fischer, Russian Liberalism (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1958).

[15] Fischer describes the "have-not liberalism" as a minority movement in an underdeveloped society. See foreword p. 8.

[16] Quoted in S. A. Smirnov, P. N. Miliukov, Sbornik materiialov po chstvovaniiu ego semidesitiletiia (Paris, 1929) p. 261.

governed the historical process. He was captivated by the idea of the laws of "political biology" which he considered universal, the laws that stated that at one certain point of development of a society a representative government was inevitable. He seemed to have disregarded the impact of the revolutionary and radical political thought on the Russian people, so much that he was making a persistent attempt to win over the revolutionary parties in his fight for liberalism in Russia. According to his positivist theory, history was on his side because, he insisted, even the marxist theory admitted that any social revolution must be preceded by a bourgeois revolution. He realized that for the socialists this revolution was only to constitute the first step, but he did not fear the second step. To his justification one has to say that there was as yet no precedent in history of "such a thing" as a socialist state and a dictatorship of proletariat.[17] Furthermore, he believed that these socialist utopians would be useful and with their cooperation, he and the liberals would succeed in overthrowing the autocracy and establishing a constitutional regime by peaceful means. His conduct, which was founded upon a priori principles, guided him toward predetermined goals that were conceived in terms of reason rather than experience.

It has been generally agreed that the basis for liberalism was the third estate, although there are other points of view

---

[17]See D. W. Treadgolt, Lenin and His Rivals (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1955).

that contest this theory. Miliukov accepted the former point of view. In his analysis of the Russian historical evolution he showed the reasons for the absence of this class in the Russian society. Yet he believed that owing to the rapid industrialization and modernization of the Russian society during the second half of the nineteenth century this estate was quickly emerging. Miliukov's hopes that he laid in this class were not well founded. This class was too weak to provide effective leadership for the masses. It seems that the liberalism of Miliukov and his party lacked an elaborate formal ideology, a theory of ethics, politics or economics, and fully disregarded the reality of Russian life. Thus, when Miliukov was asked in the afternoon of March 12, 1917, by the journalists what would be the program of the new government, he answered that "Needless to say the government program will be that of the Progressive Block."[18] This was an answer of Miliukov, the positivist historian, the professor, but not that of a clear sighted political leader.

In the historical perspective it seems that the discrepancy can be more clearly seen between the Russian reality as it was then, and Miliukov's oversimplified interpretation of it, in order to suit his a priori conceived positivist idea of liberalism. It is the irony of history that the "positivist" had to give way to the "utopian" marxist in the most crucial moment of Russia's history.

---

[18]Quoted in R. H. McNeal, "The Russian Revolution; Why Did the Bolsheviks Win?" Source problems in World Civilization (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1959) p. 38.

Miliukov, the political leader, has been criticized but Miliukov, the historian, has and still occupies a prominent place in Russian historiography. The basis for his faith in liberalism was his philosophy of history. This philosophy permitted him to write some of the best studies of Russia's past. The characteristic features of his philosophy was an optimism and belief in evolution, progress and faith in man. Miliukov wrote the history of the people in all its aspects: cultural, social, institutional, political and economic. Since the historical process was regulated by the evolutionary tendency inherent in every society, the reasons for the differences between the various historical processes of the nations were the result of the influence of the environment, and subject to change.

The ideals of freedom, the dignity of man and the creation of the utmost conditions for the free exercise of human abilities were and are worthy ideals which humanity is still struggling to achieve. Although Miliukov's liberalism was an inadequate basis for the establishment of liberal political authority in Russia his contribution to Russian historical though is widely recognized.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Books

Miliukov, P. N. Gosudarstvennoe khoziaistvo Rossii v pervoi chetverti XVIII stoletiia i reforma Petra Velikogo. St. Petersburg, 1892.

_____. Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury. Jubilee edition, Paris, 1937, Vol. I.

_____. Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury. St. Petersburg, 1896, Vol. II.

_____. Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury. Jubilee edition, Paris, 1930, Vol. III.

_____. Glavnye techeniia russkoi istoricheskoi mysli. Moscow, 1897.

_____. (Milyoukov, Paul) Russia and its Crisis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1906.

_____. God bor'by; politicheskaia khronika 1905 - 1906. St. Petersburg, 1907.

_____. Vospominaniia, 1859 - 1917. 2 vols. New York: Izdatelstvo Chekhova, 1955.

_____. Iz istorii russkoi intelligentsii. St. Petersburg, 1903.

Articles and Periodicals

Miliukov, P. N. "Russia", Athenaeum (London), July 5, 1890, July 4, 1891, July 2, 1892, July 1, 1893, July 7, 1894, July 6, 1895, July 4, 1896.

cc (P. N. Miliukov). "Chto takoe 'konsitutsiia' Loris-Melikova?" Osvobozhdenie, No. 11, November 18, 1902.

_____. "K ocherednym voprosam", Osvobozhdenie, No. 17, February 16, 1903.

_____. "Derzhavnyi maskarad", Osvobozhdenie, No. 19, March 19, 1903.

cc (P. N. Miliukov). "Voina i russkaia oppozitsiia", Osvobozhdenie, No. 43, March 7, 1904.

_____. "Voina i russkaia oppozitsiia", Osvobozhdenie, No. 45, April 2, 1904.

_____. "Ocherednyie zadachi russkikh konstitutsionalistov", Osvobozhdenie, No. 52, July 19, 1904.

_____. "Novyi kurs", Osvobozhdenie, No. 57, October 2, 1904.

_____. "Fiasko novogo kursa", Osvobozhdenie, No. 60, November 10, 1904.

_____. "Rossiia organizuetsia", Osvobozhdenie, No. 74, July 13, 1905.

_____. "Soiuz osvobozhdeniia' i drugie politicheskie partii", Osvobozhdenie, No. 74, July 13, 1905.

_____. "Itti ili ne itti v Gosudarstvennuiu dumu?", Osvobozhdenie, No. 75, August 6, 1905.

Other Sources

Miliukov, P. N. "The Chief Currents of Russian Historical Thought", American Historical Association, Annual Report for 1904.

_____. "Constitutional Government for Russia", Civic Forum Addresses, Vol. I, No. 3, January 14, 1908.

Secondary Sources

Books

Berdyaev, Nicolas. The Russian Idea. Translated from Russian by R. M. French. London: Geoffrey Bles. The Centenary Press, 1947.

Collingwood, R. G. The Idea of History. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Fedotov, George P. The Russian Religious Mind. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Fischer, George. Russian Liberalism from Gentry to Intelligentsia. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Leontowitsch, Victor. Geschichte des Liberalismus in Russland, 1762 - 1917. Frankfurt, 1957.

Masaryk, Thomas Garrigue. The Spirit of Russia. 2 vols. Translated from the German original by Eden and Cedar Paul. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1919.

Mazur, Anatole G. An Outline of Modern Russian Historiography. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939.

Pares, Bernard. The Fall of the Russian Monarchy. London: Jonathan Cape, 1939.

_____. A History of Russia. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1953.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas V. Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Smirnov, S. A. P. N. Miliukov Sbornik materiialov po chestvovaniiu ego semidesiatiletiia. Paris, 1929.

Stern, Fritz. (ed.) The Varieties of History; From Voltaire to the Present. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.

Tompkins, Stuart Ramsay. The Russian Mind from Peter the Great through the Enlightenment. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953.

Treadgold, Donald W. Lenin and His Rivals. The Struggle for Russia's Future, 1896 - 1906. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. 1955.

Pamphlets and Articles

McNeal, Robert H. "The Russian Revolution"; "Why Did the Bolsheviks Win?" Source Problems in World Civilization. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1959.

Reshetar, John S. Jr."Problems of Analyzing and Predicting Soviet Behavior", Doubleday Short Studies in Political Science. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955.

Browder, R. P. "Liberal Interpretations of the October Revolution", Texas Quarterly, Vol. I, Number 4, Winter 1958, University of Texas Press.

Karpovich, Michael. Two Types of Russian Liberalism: Maklakov and Miliukov", Continuity and Change of Russian and Soviet Thought. Edited with an Introduction by Ernest J. Simmons. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1955.